Google

This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at http://books.google.com/

LIBRARY OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

BR
755
.H94

RELIGIOUS THOUGHT IN ENGLAND

VOL. II.

RELIGIOUS THOUGHT IN ENGLAND

FROM THE REFORMATION TO THE END OF LAST CENTURY

A Contribution to the History of Theology.

BY THE REV. JOHN HUNT, M.A.

AUTHOR OF 'AN ESSAY ON PANTHEISM'

VOLUME II.

STRAHAN & CO., PUBLISHERS
56 LUDGATE HILL, LONDON
1871

TAYLOR AND CO., PRINTERS,
LITTLE QUEEN STREET, LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS.

PREFACE.

It was stated in the Preface to the First Volume that the object of this work was to trace the history of religious thought in England since the Reformation. I then intimated that I was not writing a philosophy of the history of religion, but a part of the history itself. Merely to have given my own conclusions, or my own theories, would have been easier for me, and perhaps more agreeable to the reader. But I preferred collecting and arranging material which would not only illustrate the stand-point from which I was writing, but also have a permanent value in itself.

It has been suggested by a reviewer that it would have added to the interest of the work if I had said more about the characters of the men of whom I have occasion to write, and less about their books. It was also suggested that I might have traced the connection of doctrines prominent at certain times with the same or kindred doctrines in other countries. Both these things would doubtless have been interesting, but they are beyond my province. I fixed the limits, that the work, within these limits, might be as complete as I could make it. A history of ideas could not be expected to have the same interest as a history of events; and when confined to England, there was a necessity for details that will often seem tedious. I have tried to give an account of the chief parties, the more important controversies, and of all books or tracts that have or ever had any

153151

representative value. It has been intimated that there is a principle of progress or development to be traced in this history, but I have not been forward to trace it. Its stages are not abruptly marked, and it is better that they should be left to show themselves in their final results. An oak requires centuries to complete its growth, and for that very reason, we do not think of measuring it every day to see how much it has grown.

Several reviewers have expressed a wish for more dates and references. With this wish I have endeavoured to comply, but without admitting that the first volume was deficient in either of these. Dates were not always given in figures, but it was generally mentioned who was Archbishop of Canterbury at the time of any controversy or the public activity of any great writer. I did not see the necessity of giving a reference for every quotation. This might be necessary in an argument, but it is not always necessary in giving an analysis of the subject or the contents of a book. One reviewer complained of the hardship of being unable to find the context when he met anything remarkable which he wished to examine further. He instanced the case of such a writer as Baxter, where he would have to hunt through half-a-dozen folio volumes. The case was imaginary, as there is no collected edition of Baxter's controversial works. I generally had to quote from tracts, the name of which is always mentioned. When the quotation is from a book, the subject itself will generally indicate the chapter, which may be easily found by the table of contents. In this volume I have more frequently given the page in figures, at least when the quotation is direct. In other cases, the substance of what is said will be found not far from the quotation.

It has been objected that it is difficult to know when I am giving what an author says, or only drawing my own inferences, but this is a difficulty almost inseparable from

this kind of writing. The principle I have adopted is to state impartially what I supposed any author to mean. This is sometimes done partly in the author's words and partly in mine. When I am speaking expressly for myself, it is done so as there can be no doubt who is speaking.

The present volume completes the seventeenth century, with the addition of the chief part of the Deist controversy. I have kept strictly to the plan of merely recording what men said. The significance of these controversies and their value to the philosophy of history may appear more clearly in the last volume. It is better that the reader should be left for the present to his own conclusions, and not be distracted by anything which I have to say. The mere history will itself refute many arguments which are vehemently urged in party controversies. It will also, it is to be hoped, save a great deal of writing, for many men will see that all they have to say has been said already.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

CHAPTER VII.

	Page
Schemes of Comprehension	1
The Church and the King	2
Bishop Wilkins' scheme	3
Zeal of the Commons against Nonconformists	4
Controversies on toleration	4
Nonconformists vindicated	5
Thomas Tomkyns against toleration	5
John Corbet advocates a Broad Church	6
And pleads the moderation of Nonconformists	7
Dr. Perrinchief answers John Corbet	7
And shows that toleration only increases schismatics	8
Herbert Thorndike answers John Corbet	9
Archbishop Sheldon's patronage of the intolerant clergy	9
Samuel Parker protests against the claims of conscience	10
And shows the danger to the state from toleration	11
Bishop Croft's 'Naked Truth'	11
The Fathers not to be followed as authorities	12
The Church should be built on a rock, and not on ceremonies	13
John Wilson's 'Nehushtan'	14
The Lord's Supper abused—why not abolished?	14
Simon Patrick's 'Friendly Debate'	15
He forgets the lessons he learned at Cambridge	16
Stillingfleet's 'Mischief of Separation' and 'Irenicum'	16

Page

Controversies on toleration—*continued*.

Schism defined 17
Nonconformists agree with the Church in doctrine . . 17
Baxter answers Stillingfleet 18
Conformity made more difficult by the Act of Uniformity . 18
Stillingfleet charges Baxter with 'the sin of schism' . . 19
He is answered by John Owen 20
And by 'Some Nonconformists' 21
'Assent and consent' scarcely to be given even to the Bible 22
The 'Congregational Brethren' plead for a Broad National Church 22
Stillingfleet on the 'Unreasonableness of Separation' . . 23
The Old Puritans opposed to separation 23
'The Conformists' Pleas for the Nonconformists' . . . 24
Dr. Whitby's 'Protestant Reconciler' 25
The Scriptures not a rule for ceremonies 26
Henry Dodwell on 'Separation from Episcopal Churches' . 26
The Bishop constitutes the Church 27
Episcopal sacraments necessary to salvation 28
Roman Catholic Controversy in the time of James II. . . . 29
Gibson's 'Preservative' 29
Dr. Stratford on 'The Necessity of the Reformation' . . 30
Continued by Dr. Claget 30
And Gilbert Burnet 31
Dr. Cave vindicates the Church of England from the charge of schism 31
Dean Hascard from the charge of novelty 31
No proper priesthood in the Church of England . . . 32
English orders valid and regular 33
Christ alone a proper priest 33
Dr. Lloyd on 'Papal Supremacy' 34
Dr. Resbury on the 'Visible Church' 35
Dr. Freeman on the 'Catholic Church' 35
On the name 'Catholic' 36
Roman Catholics called 'Catholics' only in conventional language 36
Dr. Patrick on Antiquity 37
The Church of England not new 38
John Williams on 'Uninterrupted Duration' 38

Page

Roman Catholic Controversy in the time of James II.—*continued.*
Popes that have been heretics 38
Dr. Fowler on 'Amplitude, or Multitude and Variety of Believers' 38
Dr. Thorp on the 'Succession of Bishops' 39
Dr. Payne on 'Agreement in Doctrine with the Primitive Church' 39
Dr. Claget on the 'Union of the Members among themselves and with their Head' 40
Dr. Scott on 'Sanctity of Doctrine' 40
Dr. Linford on 'Efficacy of Doctrine' 41
Thomas Tenison on 'Holiness of Life' 42
Resbury on the 'Glory of Miracles' 42
Other notes of the Church 42
Tenison and Sherlock on 'The Rule of Faith' . . . 43
Dryden's 'Hind and Panther' 44
A Roman Catholic monarch not compatible with the existence of the Church of England 45
Passive obedience 45
Samuel Johnson's 'Julian the Apostate' 46
Was the Roman empire hereditary? 46
Julian treated with contempt by the Christians . . . 47
The Bishop of Nazianzum threatens to 'kick' Julian . . 48
The Christians sing psalms against him 48
And dance in their churches when they hear of his death . 49
The first Christians suffered according to the laws, under Julian against the laws 49
The King subject to the law 50
'Constantius the Apostate,' an answer to 'Julian' . . 50
'Jovian,' another answer to 'Julian' 51
The Roman empire not hereditary 52
The Bishop of Nazianzum did not wish to kick the Emperor 52
No tyrants to be resisted if they are kings 53
Sherlock's 'Case of Resistance' 54
'Julian's Arts to Undermine and Extirpate Christianity' . 55
Constantius not an Apostate 55
The Homilies do not teach passive obedience . . . 56
The compilers of them assisted other nations against evil rulers 56
The Christians resisted Julian 57

Page

Passive obedience—*continued.*

Non-resistance practically refuted 57
The bishops oppose the exercise of the royal prerogative, and are prosecuted and acquitted 59
The conversion of Dr. Sherlock 60
He advocates allegiance to William and Mary . . . 61
His conversion due to Bishop Overall's 'Convocation Book' . 61
Sherlock's adversaries 62
His doctrine resolved into Might is Right 63
Cromwell's government legalized by Sherlock's rule . . 63
The Nonjurors deny that there has been a 'thorough' settlement 64
Dr. Hickes answers Sherlock 65
Stillingfleet writes against the New Separation . . . 66
Proves from English history the lawfulness of the new oaths 67
The Nonjurors and Schism 67
The Nonjuring bishops 68
Sancroft's sermon at the first consecration after the Restoration 68
Crete and England compared 69
Sancroft recommends a friendly alliance with Nonconformists 70
Bishop Ken 70
A narrow Churchman 71
His sermon on Daniel 72
Bishop Turner answers 'Naked Truth' 72
Disputes the brevity of the Christian creed 73
Recommends that people be compelled to go to church . . 74
Bishop Thomas 74
Dr. Hickes' Sermons 75
Charles II. the head stone of the corner 75
Hickes on the 'Real Presence' 76
On the French Protestants 77
John Kettlewell 78
His rational explanations of faith and revelation . . . 79
Limits his explanations 79
Attaches great importance to the mere rites of religion . . 79
Defends passive obedience 80
Jeremy Collier and the immorality of the stage . . . 81
The Usages controversy 82
Charles Leslie 82
His doctrines 83

Page

The Nonjurors and Schism—*continued.*

Leslie's views of episcopal authority 84
Henry Dodwell 85
The soul made immortal by episcopal baptism . . . 85
Dodwell consistently condemns the English Reformation . 86
The Church of England become schismatical 86
The last of the Nonjurors 87
Isaac Barrow 88
On the Creed 89
His theology 90
On the sacraments 09
His sermons ethical 91
Makes religion appeal to the interests of men . . . 92
On the Pope's Supremacy 92
St. Peter's supposed primacy 93
St. Peter left no will 94
Archbishop Leighton 95
A Calvinist 96
Opposed to oaths and impositions 96
And to re-ordination 97

CHAPTER VIII.

A new era in the history of the Church of England . . . 98
Archbishop Tillotson 99
Importance of an acquaintance with his theology . . . 100
Decline of sacerdotalism, witchcraft, and Calvinism . . 100
On the atonement 101
On the moral constitution of man 102
On the influence of rewards and punishments . . . 103
Appeals to self-interest 104
The old theology struggles with the new 104
Reason and faith 106
Moral certainty of the truth of Christianity 107
Argument from miracles 107
Inspiration 108

Page

Archbishop Tillotson—*continued.*
The veracity of God the foundation of faith 109
Natural religion more certain than revealed 110
Archbishop Sharp 111
On the Church 112
On the truth of Christianity 113
On predestination 114
Faith and reason 114
On the Sabbath 115
On the Eucharist 115
Bishop Kidder 116
The 'Demonstration of the Messias' 116
Against the Jews 117
Prophecies of the Messias 117
Was the Messias to work miracles? 118
Miracles a good testimony 119
Evidence that Jesus wrought miracles 120
The Messias was to suffer 120
Jewish genealogies uncertain 121
On the Pentateuch 122
Bishop Patrick 123
At Cambridge 124
Becomes a Conformist 125
On the Sacraments 125
The Puritan doctrine of Sacraments 126
Baptism explained as admission to a covenant . . . 126
'Mensa Mystica' 127
On the 'real presence' 128
The sacrifice of the Supper 128
'The Witnesses of Christianity' 129
Bishop Fowler 130
On the Latitudinarians 131
The Christianity of Christ 131
Christianity rational 132
The Latitudinarians and doctrine 133
The 'Design of Christianity' 134
Bishop Stillingfleet 135
The 'Irenicum' 135
The primitive Church a broad Church 136
No church polity in the New Testament 136

Page

Bishop Stillingfleet—*continued.*
Origin and development of church government . . . 137
The 'Origines Sacræ' 138
Scripture histories defended 139
The genesis of Deism 140
Dr. Laud's 'Labyrinth,' or how do we know the Scriptures to be divine without the infallible Church? . . . 141
Laud defended 141
Faith resolved into probabilities which amount to moral certainty 142
Archbishop Tenison 143
Conference with Pulton 144
Tenison's charity 145
Bishop Burnet 145
On Christ's satisfaction for sin 145
On Episcopacy 146
On baptism 147
On the eucharist 147
Bishop Moore 148
Bishop Grove 149
Bishop Williams 149
On revelation 150
The certainty of it 151
Marks of the true revelation 151
Miracles not necessary for immediate revelation . . . 152
The truth of Scripture 153
It rests on the providence of God 153
William Sherlock 154
His 'Discourse concerning the Knowledge of Christ' . . 154
Denies the doctrine of satisfaction to divine justice . . 155
John Scott 156
On rational religion 157
On the 'Christian Life' 157
Natural religion the foundation of revealed 158
Dr. William Outram 158
On the sacrifice of Christ 158
Christ an expiatory victim 159
Dr. Daniel Whitby 160
On the evidences of Christianity 161
Christian miracles and other miracles 161

Page

Dr. Daniel Whitby—*continued.*
The miracles of the early Church 162
On original sin 163
God's justice defended 164
Original sin and infant baptism 164
Sermon on reason 165
All parties assume the supremacy of reason . . . 166
God knowable if revealed 167
The Scriptures the only rule of faith 167
Christians to prove all things 168
Later creeds more obscure than the Apostles' Creed . 169
Joseph Glanvill 170
His scepticism 170
On the pre-existence of souls 171
The theories of creation and propagation of souls refuted . 172
Pre-existence of souls proved from Scripture . . . 173
Lord Bacon and induction 174
The Royal Society 174
Its history by Bishop Sprat 174
Christianity and philosophy 175
Supposed danger to religion from natural studies . . 175
Christianity established by the inductive method . . 176
The Church of England the patron of science . . . 177
And represents the commercial and enterprising genius of the nation 178
The Hon. Robert Boyle 179
His 'Excellency of Theology' 179
By 'theology' he means 'revelation' as distinguished from natural theology 180
'The Christian Virtuoso' 181
'Discourse of Things above Reason' 182
The 'Discourse' continued 183
John Locke 183
On grounds of certainty 184
Morality eternal 184
Revelation altogether distinct from natural religion . . 185
Yet not to be received if it contradicts natural knowledge . 186
Locke denies that natural religion is clearer than revealed . 187
The 'Reasonableness of Christianity' 188
Locke orthodox on the atonement 188

Page

John Locke—*continued.*

Cessation of being the natural result of Adam's sin . . 189
Locke's opponents 190
Sir Isaac Newton 191
His interpretation of prophecy 191
On the Trinitarian texts 192
On the Arian controversy 192
Himself an Arian 193

CHAPTER IX.

The supremacy of reason 194
Dr. Bury's 'Naked Gospel' 195
The Gospel is mainly love to God and man 195
Faith means obedience 196
Speculations concerning the incarnation not necessary and dangerous 197
The Gospel independent of the speculations 198
Le Clerc vindicates 'The Naked Gospel' 199
William Nicholls refutes 'The Naked Gospel' 200
Beginning of the great Trinitarian controversy 201
Thomas Firmin's tracts 202
The Athanasian Creed not Catholic 202
Sherlock on the Trinity 203
Makes saving faith belief in the Athanasian Creed . . . 203
The Trinity.—Three persons but one substance . . . 204
Dr. Wallis on the Trinity 205
Dr. Jane answers Dr. Wallis 206
Dr. Wallis answered by a Unitarian 207
And by an Arian 207
Dr. Wallis defends himself 208
Dr. Jane receives Sherlock's view of the Trinity, but rejects his explanations 208
South answers Sherlock 209
Mystery defined 210
Person defined 211
Different forms of the Trinity 212

Page

The great Trinitarian controversy—*continued.*

South's view that of the schoolmen 213
John Howe on the Trinity 213
Person not the same as substance 214
Sherlock answers Howe 214
Firmin's 'Third Collection of Tracts' 215
Unitarians did not deny the expiatory sacrifice of Christ . 216
Bishop Burnet on the Trinity 217
Unitarians worship Christ 217
Tillotson on the Trinity 218
The Word made flesh 218
Dr. Williams defends Tillotson 219
Bishop Burnet on satisfaction 219
'The Agreement of the Unitarians with the Catholic Church' 219
No real difference between Unitarians and Trinitarians . . 220
Sherlock's doctrine condemned by the University of Oxford . 221
Sherlock preaches against reason before the Lord Mayor and Aldermen 221
Declares that what Scripture says is to be received, though contrary to reason 222
Dr. Thomas Burnet's Archæologiæ Philosophicæ 223
His 'Theory of the Earth' 223
No seas nor hills before the Flood 223
How the mountains were formed 224
St. Peter on the world before the Flood 224
Dr. Burnet's heresies refuted by Bishop Croft . . . 224
Burnet declares the Mosaic creation to be a myth . . . 225
Charles Blount and Deism 225
His 'Life of Apollonius' 226
Nathaniel Taylor replies to Blount's 'Oracles of Reason' . 226
Revelation necessary because of the doctrine of satisfaction . 227
Charles Leslie's 'Short and Easy Method with the Deists' . . 228
The impossibility of the books of Moses being forgeries . . 229
Arguments for the truth of Christianity 229
Charles Gildon converted by Leslie's 'Short and Easy Method' 230
And writes 'The Deists' Manual' 231
Leslie refutes the Unitarians 231
Denies that they are Christians 232
Proves Tillotson to be a blasphemer, a Deist, and an Atheist 233

Page

Charles Leslie—*continued.*

'The Growth of Deism' 234
'The Five Groans of the Church' 235
'The Growth of Error' 235
John Toland 236
His 'Christianity not Mysterious' 236
Its object to defend Christianity 237
He applies Bacon's method to the Scriptures 237
Reason is above Fathers and Councils 238
Toland builds on Locke's philosophy 239
Revelation must agree with our natural ideas . . . 240
Nothing in the Gospel above reason 241
No mystery in Christianity 242
The Fathers on Toland's side 242
Mysteries introduced into Christianity from the Pagans . 243
'Christianity not Mysterious' presented by the Grand Jury of Middlesex 243
Burned by order of the Irish Parliament 244
Refuted by Oliver Hill 245
By Thomas Beconsall 245
By John Gailhard 245
By Thomas Beverley 245
By John Norris 246
By Peter Browne, afterwards Bishop of Cork . . . 247
By Edward Synge, Archbishop of Tuam 248
Toland the cause of the controversy between Locke and Stillingfleet 248
Locke repudiates Toland's principles 249
Toland's 'Letters to Serena' 250
Toland generally supposed to be a Deist 251
He writes the 'Life of Milton' 251
Ascribes 'Eikon Basilike' to Bishop Gauden 252
Dr. Blackhall preaches against Toland before the House of Commons 252
Toland defends the 'Life of Milton' 252
And raises a controversy about the canon of Scripture . . 253
Samuel Clarke on the defence of the 'Life of Milton' . . 253
Stephen Nye defends the canon of Scripture . . . 253
Richardson's 'Canon of the New Testament Vindicated' . 254
Jeremiah Jones vindicates the canon 255

Page

John Toland—*continued.*
Toland publishes 'Nazarenus' 256
Maintains that the Ebionites were the Nazarenes . . . 257
Thomas Mangey answers 'Nazarenus' 257
Defends the Gentile Christians 258
Thomas Brett on 'Nazarenus' 259
Paterson's 'Anti-Nazarenus'. 259
Toland's character 259
His excessive vanity 260
His 'Pantheisticon' 261
His epitaph for himself 262
Dr. South 262
A Calvinist 263
Yet his theology often rational 263
His 'moral preaching' 264
Religion profitable and 'safe' 265
Bishop Bull 265
On justification 266
The 'Harmonia Apostolica' 266
Answers to it 267
'Defence of the Nicene Faith' 267
Testimony of the Fathers 268
'The Judgment of the Catholic Church' 268
Bishop Beveridge 269
The theology of Calvin has the universal consent of the Fathers 270
John Norris 271
His theology from Malebranche 271
The Logos in all men 271
John Ray 272
Belongs to the Royal Society 272

Appendix to Chapter IX.:—

Tracts on the Unitarian controversy 273

CHAPTER X.

	Page
The Act of Toleration	279
Vindicated by John Locke	279
The Church of England and the civil magistrate	280
The duties of the State distinct from those of the Church	281
Locke's doctrine of Church and State that of the Church of England	281
The Bill of Comprehension	281
Its provisions	282
The Royal Commission	283
Their discussions	284
Changes in the Prayer-book	285
The Nonconformists satisfied	285
Sects beyond the reach of comprehension	286
The Quakers	286
They pretend a Divine commission	287
The Quakers and the Bible	287
William Penn	288
His theology	288
On satisfaction for sin and imputed righteousness	289
He denies that satisfaction was necessary	290
'Christ within'	290
The Spirit and the Scriptures	291
Is the Spirit enough without the Scriptures?	291
The Pagans had the light within	292
Which is the rule of faith—the Spirit or the Scriptures?	293
Creeds disparaged	294
Toleration advocated	295
Barclay's 'Apology'	295
The Quakers had no affection for Cromwell	295
Their Divine Commission	296

Page

William Penn—*continued.*

What is revelation? 296
Revelation universal 297
And not limited to the Bible 298
Quakers orthodox 299
George Keith answers Penn and Barclay 300
Keith's 'Retractations' 300
Light within not the rule of faith 301
The Quakers and Deism 302
Charles Leslie against the Quakers 303
Their blasphemy 303
The Baptists 304
John Bunyan 304
His terrible theology 305
His too literal interpretations of Scripture 306
Incongruities of his theology 306
His controversial writings 307
His answer to Dr. Fowler's 'Design of Christianity' . . 308
On reprobation 309
On the Sabbath 310
On close communion 311
Baptism indifferent 311
Not necessary to make a Christian 312
Union of Presbyterians and Independents 313
Occasional Conformity 314
The Lord Mayor at Pinners' Hall 314
De Foe on occasional conformity 315
Answered by John Howe 315
'The Shortest Way' with the Dissenters 316
Sacheverell and Leslie against occasional Conformity . . 317
'Moderation a Virtue' 318
Lord Barrington on occasional conformity 318
Bishop Burnet defends it 319
Dr. Bates 320
Necessity of satisfaction for sin 321
John Flavel 321
On the soul 322
Samuel Clark 322
On verbal inspiration 322

Page

Samuel Clark—*continued.*
He proves it from Scripture itself 323
Maintains the Divine authority of the Hebrew points . . 324
Changes among the Presbyterians 324
Thomas Emlyn 325
Teaches Arianism 326
Denies that Christ is the supreme God 327
Answered by Joseph Boyse 327
On the worship of Christ 328
Do Roman Catholics give Christ the highest worship? 329
Augustine worshipped Christ's humanity 330
Bishop Fowler on the pre-existence of Christ . . . 330
Emlyn on Leslie's 'Dialogues' 331
On baptism 332

CHAPTER XI.

Natural religion 333
Reason and revelation 333
Authority of Scripture 334
Nathaniel Culverwell 334
'The Light of Nature' 334
No jarring between faith and reason 334
Light of nature seen in the Pagan world 335
Eternal law really God 335
Extent of the law of nature 336
Human reason is divine 337
The Scriptures the foundation of the Church . . . 338
William Wollaston 338
His 'Religion of Nature Delineated' 338
Reason shows that there is a God 339
Objections to a special Providence 340

Page

William Wollaston—*continued.*

Human duties 341
'The Religion of Jesus Delineated' 341
From Christianity to Deism 342
Lord Shaftesbury 342
Ridicule the test of religion 343
This liable to be misunderstood 344
The Jews could not endure raillery 345
The disposition of mind necessary for the consideration of religion 346
Morality eternal 347
And not dependent on the word of God 347
Right and wrong discernible by reason, and by their consequences 348
Rewards and punishments a security for virtue . . . 349
Deism not fairly inferred from Shaftesbury's doctrine of virtue 349
Selfishness has a good as well as a bad sense . . . 350
'Whatever is, is right' 351
Pope's 'Essay on Man' 352
Man's error in supposing himself the final cause of creation 352
The Author of nature studies the general good . . . 353
Individuals sacrificed for the general good 354
Physical and moral evil serve the general good . . . 354
Shaftesbury's theology follows Spinoza 355
Pope follows Shaftesbury 356
Relation of optimism to Christianity 357
Foundation of Shaftesbury's Deism 357
His treatment of miracles 358
On the rule of faith 358
Supremacy of reason 359
Brown's 'Essay on the Characteristics' 360
Shows that anything may be ridiculed 361
The unselfish philosophy reviewed 361
Balguy's 'Letter to a Deist' 362
He maintains the necessity of rewards 363
Anonymous replies to Shaftesbury 364
A 'Letter not in Raillery' 365

Page

Lord Shaftesbury—*continued.*
'Bart'lemy Fair' 365
Mandeville's 'Fable of the Bees' 365
He defends vice 366
Bishop Butler on Shaftesbury 366
Berkeley's 'Minute Philosopher' 367
On ridicule applied to test religion 368
Warburton on Shaftesbury 369
Anthony Collins 369
Use of reason in religion 370
Revelation must not contradict reason 371
Contradictions, however, may be only apparent . . . 371
'Vindication of the Divine Attributes' 372
Immateriality of the soul does not prove its immortality . 373
'Discourse of Free-thinking' 373
Duty of free-thinking 374
'Essay on the Thirty-nine Articles' 375
'The Grounds and Reasons' 376
Prophecies have a sense typical or secondary . . . 377
Whiston's views on prophecy 378
Says the Old Testament texts were corrupted by the Jews 378
This incredible 378
Answers to Collins 372
By Richard Bentley 380
Dr. Francis Hare 381
Dr. Daniel Williams 381
And John Addicombe 382
Bishop Chandler on prophecy 382
Universal expectation of a Messiah among the Jews and Gentiles 383
Virgil and the Messianic prophecies 384
Cicero and the Sibylline verses 384
The Jewish longing for the Messiah 385
Twelve Messianic prophecies 385
The messenger of the covenant 385
The coming of Elijah 385
The desire of nations 386
The Son of David 386

Page

Anthony Collins—*continued.*

The Messiah a sufferer 386
The great kingdom 387
The Son of man 387
The seventy weeks 387
The ruler in Israel 388
He that was to come 388
The rebuilding of the tabernacle of David 388
The righteous servant 389
Prophecies typical and allegorical 389
St. Matthew's quotations from the Old Testament are merely accommodations 389
Whiston's 'Literal Accomplishment of Scripture Prophecy' 390
He restores the true text of the prophecies 391
Samuel Clarke replies to Collins 391
And Arthur Ashley Sykes 392
Bishop Kidder gives up Isaiah vii. 14 393
Sykes recommends moderation 394
Thomas Sherlock on prophecy 394
Samuel Chandler and Dr. Lobb on prophecy 395
Collins's 'Literal Scheme' 395
Chandler's twelve Messianic prophecies considered . . 396
'Son of man' the Roman empire 397
Zerubbabel 'the ruler in Israel' 398
Collins's sincerity 399

Thomas Woolston 400
On the fulness of time 400
'The Old Apology for Christianity Revived' 400
'Aristobulus' 401
'Free Gifts to the Clergy' 401
Woolston scarcely sane 402
His object 403
Allegorical interpretations 404
'Discourses on the Miracles' 404
Casting the traders out of the Temple only a parable . . 405
The demoniacs of Gadara 406
The transfiguration 406
The woman with the issue of blood 407

Page

Thomas Woolston—*continued*.

The woman with the spirit of infirmity 407
The woman of Samaria 408
The cursing of the fig-tree 408
The lame man at the pool of Bethesda 409
The five porches are the five books of Moses 410
The man born blind 410
The turning water into wine 411
The healing of the paralytic 412
The resurrection of Lazarus 412
Was Lazarus really dead? 413
Allegorical meaning of these miracles 414
The resurrection of Jesus 414
Woolston's opponents 415
Nathanael Lardner on the miracles 416
Simon Brown on miracles 416
Bishop Smalbroke on miracles 417
The Fathers did not deny the literal meaning . . . 418
A miracle defined 418
False miracles 419
Woolston's arguments frivolous 420
The swine in Gadara 420
The woman with the issue of blood 421
The cursing of the fig-tree 421
The man at the pool of Bethesda 422
The man born blind 423
Arguments from omissions not valid 424
Bishop Pearce on the miracles of Jesus 424
Objections to the resurrection of Jesus answered . . . 425
The disciples did not believe that He was to rise again . . 426
Difficulties may sometimes be explained 426
The time of figs 427
Sherlock's 'Trial of the Witnesses' 428
Probability or possibility of miracles 429
The resurrection of Jesus 430
Character of Woolston's mind 431

Matthew Tindal 431
At Oxford 432
High Church and Low Church 433

Page

Matthew Tindal—*continued.*

'The Rights of the Christian Church' 433
'Christianity as Old as Creation' 434
Does not depend on authority 434
But by a revelation to reason 435
The religion of nature 436
The rational life a righteous life 437
Punishment is for the good of the sinner 438
Worship is for our benefit, not for God's 438
Natural and revealed religion the same in essence . . . 439
Neglect of reason the cause of superstition 440
Divine laws never arbitrary 441
Positive religion less important than morality . . . 441
Superstition the enemy of religion 442
And often destructive of morality 443
Creeds and rites substituted for religion 443
Reason infallible 444
By reason we know that the Scriptures come from God . . 444
The Scriptures appeal to reason 445
And can be tested by reason 446
Internal evidence surer than external 446
Tindal and Samuel Clarke 447
Deism a consistent scheme before Christianity . . . 447
Yet insufficient 448
Perplexity of the philosophers 449
Uncertainty even under the Gospel 450
Tindal calls himself a Christian Theist 450
Dr. Stebbing against Tindal 451
He explains and defends Clarke's meaning 451
Doctrines necessary to salvation 452
What is Christianity? 453
John Balguy against Tindal 454
Explains Clarke 455
And maintains the agreement of Christianity with natural religion 455
Conybeare replies to Tindal 456
Shows the necessity of revelation 457
And makes law to depend on the will of God 457
What God does cannot be arbitrary 458

Page

Matthew Tindal—*continued.*

Dr. Leland replies to Tindal 459
Object of positive commands 460
Insufficiency of reason 460
John Jackson replies to Tindal 461
Bishop Gibson and Tindal 462

APPENDIX.

(A) Works on Practical Religion 463
(B) The Bishops from 1661 to 1720 467

RELIGIOUS THOUGHT IN ENGLAND

VOL. II.

CHAPTER VII.

SCHEMES OF COMPREHENSION.—BISHOP CROFT ON 'NAKED TRUTH.'—CONTROVERSIES ABOUT CONFORMITY.—STILLINGFLEET.—BAXTER.—OWEN.—PATRICK.—WHITBY.—THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CONTROVERSY UNDER JAMES II.—DRYDEN'S 'HIND AND PANTHER.'—PASSIVE OBEDIENCE.—SAMUEL JOHNSON'S 'JULIAN THE APOSTATE.'—'CONSTANTIUS THE APOSTATE.'—DR. HICKES' 'JOVIAN.'—JAMES II. AND THE SEVEN BISHOPS.—SHERLOCK ON ALLEGIANCE.—ANSWERS TO SHERLOCK.—THE NON-JURORS.—ISAAC BARROW.—ARCHBISHOP LEIGHTON.

THE Act of Uniformity had passed the Commons by a very small majority.* It was the work of some resolute Churchmen who were bent on the exclusion of the Puritans. We can only guess at the amount of favour which it met among the great body of the clergy. Many who had been zealous for the Covenant became ardent Churchmen. Some refused to conform, and many, who had overcome their own scruples, sympathized with the Nonconformists. A year had not elapsed before some on both sides had begun to devise schemes of comprehension. The majority of the nonconforming Ministers were Presbyterians; that is to say, they belonged to the party which

Schemes of Comprehension.

* Neal says 186 against 180. Hallam corrects Neal, and says there was no division at all on the Bill, and only one on a part of it. Dr. Stoughton corrects Hallam, and says that there were at least four divisions on parts of the Bill. Neal, after all, is probably right. He adds that 'it met with greater obstacles among the Lords, who offered several amendments, which occasioned conferences between the two houses. The Lords would have exempted schoolmasters, tutors, and those who had the education of youth.' All historians are agreed that the House of Commons, after the Restoration, was less tolerant than the House of Lords. Macaulay says they were more zealous for royalty than the King, more zealous for Episcopacy than the bishops.

CHAP. VII.

bore that name, but who would have been satisfied with the scheme of Episcopacy laid down by Archbishop Ussher. They were not far from conformity. They were peaceable and loyal subjects. By their influence chiefly the nation had been induced to bring back the King. Charles had promised them considerable changes in the government and ritual of the Church. The promise was never fulfilled. They were now, in a sense, Nonconformists against their will. They desired comprehension, and one party at least in the Church desired to comprehend them.

The Church and the King.

The present comprehensive character of the Church of England is a result of history, and not in any sense the product of the intention of any party. At the Reformation, the Church was established on its national basis. The King was regarded as identical with the nation, and with him the Church seemed to stand or fall. Since that time the kings of England had been zealous for the Church, and subjects, who regarded themselves as pre-eminently true Churchmen, had never failed to sacrifice life and property in defence of the King. Like Hippocrates' twins, to use Stillingfleet's illustration, the Church and the King rejoiced and wept together. It seemed impossible that their cause could ever be other than one. These Churchmen made two natural mistakes. They supposed themselves to be the Church of England, and the King to be the English people. The Restoration triumph was of short duration, longer indeed in appearance than in reality. The bishops, who had browbeaten and outschemed the Puritans at the Savoy Conference, soon found that the King could be as faithless to them as he had been to the Presbyterians. In the extravagance of their loyalty lay their danger. The divinely-appointed ruler was secretly of another religion, if of any religion at all. He began to devise schemes against the Church of which he was the head. The efforts of Charles and his successor to exercise the dispensing power in behalf of toleration belong to the history of England. We have to do with them here only as introducing a new element into the controversy between Conformist and Nonconformist.*

* Charles proposed a Comprehension for Presbyterians, and an Indulgence for Independents, in which Roman Catholics were to be included.

CHAP. VII.

In 1667, the Presbyterians proposed conditions on which they were willing to conform. The conditions were drawn up in the form of a Bill for Parliament. It was asked that ministers ordained by Presbyters might be instituted to benefices by subscribing to the doctrinal articles, and that the word 'consent' be omitted in the subscription to the Prayer Book, which was only to receive 'assent.' It was asked that an incumbent who scrupled to use the Prayer Book himself might get another clergyman to read it. The 'three nocent ceremonies' were to be left at the option of the minister. The Bill for this scheme was never presented in Parliament, but it prepared the way for that which was proposed next year to the Presbyterians. Bishop Wilkins' scheme, as it is called, had the support of Churchmen of his own school, and of the leading Nonconformists. It originated with the Lord Keeper Bridgeman, and was earnestly supported by Sir Matthew Hale, Lord Chief Baron, and the Earl of Manchester, who was then Lord Chamberlain. The King was favourable, and the Duke of Buckingham took a great interest in it, out of opposition, it is said, to Lord Clarendon. For those ordained by Presbyters, Bishop Wilkins proposed that they might receive imposition of hands by the bishop as simply a calling according to the present law. The Bishop might use such words as these: 'Take thou *legal* authority to preach the Word of God, and to administer the Sacraments, in any congregation of the Church of England when thou shalt be lawfully called thereunto.' The word 'legal' was accepted by the Presbyterians as a compromise, instead of a declaration that by this ordination they did not renounce their former ordination. They also suggested that there should only be required 'approval'

Bishop Wilkins' Scheme of Comprehension.

This was regarded as an unlawful exercise of the dispensing power. It was opposed out of hatred both to Roman Catholics and to Nonconformists. Instead of agreeing to the King's scheme of toleration, Parliament passed an Act for the prohibition of Conventicles. In 1665, the King again proposed a toleration for Nonconformists on condition of an annual payment. This was firmly opposed by the bishops, and from this date Clarendon reckons the complete separation between them and the King. The Commons still showed great zeal for the Church against the dispensing prerogative of the King. They passed this year the Five-Mile-Act, by which every Nonconformist minister was forbidden, under a heavy penalty, to come within five miles of any city or borough which sends a member to Parliament, or any parish in which, since the 'Act of Oblivion,' he had been 'pastor, vicar, or lecturer.'

CHAP. VII.

of the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England; that some things in the Prayer Book on which there were differences of opinion might be optional; that the word 'sacramentally' might be added after 'regenerated' in the Baptismal Service; the doctrine of the Lord's Supper in the Catechism changed; and the absolution in the Visitation of the Sick made conditional. On all essential questions between Conformists and Nonconformists both sides had come to an agreement. For once in the history of the Reformed Church of England the wounds were almost healed. Hitherto there had been railing controversies, in which men, moved by the spirit of party, magnified their differences, and made the breach wider. Now there had been a peaceable conference between the judicious men of both sides, and the result was a satisfactory basis for a permanent union. But the spirit of the framers of the Act of Uniformity was still mighty in the House of Commons. They voted that no Bill of Comprehension should be passed that year, but rather that the laws against the Nonconformists be more rigidly enforced.*

Zeal of the Commons against Nonconformists.

Contemporaneous with proposals for toleration and declarations of indulgence, the Nonconformist controversy went on under various forms. We have to trace it chiefly in a multitude of tracts, few of which are of much value or contain anything which had not been often said before. The liberal principles of Hooker were the guide of many Conformists, but some took the narrower ground of Episcopacy by divine right. The Nonconformists had made great progress since their ancestors fought for the divine institution of the 'Holy Discipline.' They had their turn in the work

* In 1672, the King again published a 'Declaration of Indulgence,' which had the same intention and the same effect as all similar efforts. It was meant to secure toleration for Roman Catholics; it ended in allying Churchmen with Dissenters, and in creating new laws against all Nonconformists, whether Roman or Puritan. The Commons asked the King to withdraw his 'Declaration,' and then, with the support of the King and the approbation of the Puritans, they passed the Test Act which excluded Roman Catholics from civil offices. A Bill passed the Commons for the relief of Protestant Dissenters, but it was rejected by the Lords. They were thus left in the same position as the Roman Catholics. In 1675, a scheme of Comprehension, similar to that of Bishop Wilkins, was proposed by Tillotson, Stillingfleet, and other eminent Churchmen, and approved by Baxter. It is said also to have been supported by some of the bishops who had opposed the former Bill. The dread of Popery tended to unite all Protestants.

of compulsion in the time of the Long Parliament, but they had been so often sufferers that toleration for others had begun to appear a necessity. For a fair estimate of the tone of the Nonconformists of this time, we may take an anonymous tract called 'A Proposition made to King and Parliament for the Happiness and Safety of the Kingdom.'* The author called himself 'A Lover of Sincerity.' He described the Nonconformists as inoffensive people. There was nothing, he said, against them but what Pliny charged on the first Christians—that they met together for preaching and prayer. He spoke of the zeal which some had for uniformity; but that, he said, was not unity, as no external force could change men's convictions. The multitude of Nonconformists are described as having no objections to bishops, organs, or the Book of Common Prayer. What they object to is declarations, oaths, subscriptions. They are afraid to perjure themselves. Severe impositions, the writer said, defeat the object of the imposers. Men's spirits naturally rise against compulsion. In the time of Charles I. all the Puritans wore their hair short. Laud made an order that all the clergy should have their hair short, but the Puritans were the first to rebel and claim the right to wear long hair. The author recommended entire freedom of worship, with the regulation that the meeting-houses might be open during service wherever there was any fear of disloyalty to the King or the Government.

Nonconformists vindicated.

The answer to this tract was a specimen of the worst spirit of the party which triumphed at the Restoration. It was written by Thomas Tomkyns, chaplain to Archbishop Sheldon, and is called 'The Inconveniences of Toleration.' It was denied that the Nonconformists were inoffensive people. They could devour widows' houses as well as make long prayers. For proof of this it was enough to mention the times of 'the late usurper.' Toleration was condemned in Scripture. The Church of Pergamos sinned in suffering them to remain in its communion who held 'the doctrine of Balaam' and 'the doctrine of the Nicolaitanes.' A Church should keep itself pure; it should reject those who hold false doctrines, and have no communion with them.

Thomas Tomkyns against Toleration.

* Published in 1667. The author's name is said to have been Jenkyns.

CHAP. VII.

The modern Puritans, Tomkyns described as being like their forefathers in the time of Queen Elizabeth. They chose for troubling the Church a time when there was great trouble in the State. But this was only in accordance with their seditious principles. They set their own Church authority above that of the State. This was proved by many quotations from documents which chiefly concerned the Presbyterians of Scotland, especially by the words of Andrew Melville. When summoned before the King and his Council, Melville said that 'what was spoken in the pulpit ought first to be tried by the Presbytery, and neither King nor Council might in the first instance meddle therewith, though the speeches were treasonable.'*

John Corbet advocates a Broad Church,

In the same year a similar controversy was begun by John Corbet, in a 'Discourse of the Religion of England.' Corbet had been Rector of Bramshot in Hampshire, before the Act of Uniformity. About the time of the Restoration he had written a book called 'The Interest of England in the Matter of Religion.' In this book he had advocated a comprehensive Church wide enough to embrace the bishops and the Presbyterians. There was, he said, no ground, either in reason or justice, why one party should be exalted and another subverted. It would be for the interest of the State and of the Protestant religion to protect and encourage both parties by a just and equal accommodation. The tract of 1667 was without the author's name, but the principles advocated were the same. Three religious parties, the writer said, existed in England, the Conformists, the Protestant Dissenters, and the Roman Catholics. The doctrines of the last were regarded as subversive of civil government, and for that reason toleration of them was impossible. It was part of their religion to kill kings, and to persecute all who differed from them. The Reformed religion, on the other hand, makes good subjects and good Christians. In the balance of Protestantism the Nonconformists were of great moment. They were satisfied with

* Quoted on the authority of Spottiswood. Jenkyns wrote an answer to Tomkyns, showing that though the Nonconformists could join in Common Prayer, yet they could not give their assent to everything without some change. Tomkyns wrote again in the same spirit as before.

the Church of England in doctrine, and asked simply a change or toleration in a few points of ecclesiastical polity. They were not people to be despised as insignificant, for they represented no small part of the sobriety, frugality, and industry of the nation. They were not 'the great wasters, but mostly in the number of getters.' To meet the circumstances of the times, Corbet advocated an 'establishment, a limited toleration, and a discreet connivance.' He pleaded with those in power to show moderation, and to make the great essentials of Christianity the foundation of unity. In order to this they must revise the Act of Uniformity. The Church of England, he said, was once divided between Calvinists and Arminians, and now both parties are peaceably comprehended. The difficulty of comprehending Conformists and Nonconformists would not be greater than this. The more solid part of the Nonconformists, it was urged, would readily acquiesce in a widened establishment. Those of narrow and rigid principles were to be persuaded to moderation. This union of Protestants was shown to be for the interest of the King, of the clergy, the nobility, the gentry, and indeed the whole nation.

And pleads the moderation of Nonconformists.

Corbet's book was answered by Dr. Perrinchief and Herbert Thorndike, both Prebendaries of Westminster; also in an anonymous tract called 'Dolus an Virtus?' Perrinchief's treatise was 'A Discourse of Toleration.' He could not justify giving licence to Dissenters and schismatics, for all dissension and schism had their beginning in the evil passions of evil men. The Apostles had set forth the authors of heresies as those who served not the Lord Jesus Christ, but had made shipwreck of faith. This was proved with great learning, and confirmed by the history of the Church. The abominations of the Gnostics were not to be named even by a sober heathen. The Donatists were the great disturbers of the North African Church, and their schism began at the election of Cæcilianus, Bishop of Carthage, through the ambition of Botrus and Cælesius, two of the unsuccessful competitors for the office. Schismatics Dr. Perrinchief describes as cunning men who lie in wait to deceive, and who speak 'great swelling words.' Their followers have itching ears, and are laden with divers

Dr. Perrinchief answers John Corbet.

CHAP. VII.

lusts. No man can think otherwise of the greatest part (Dissenters. They are like the old Manichees, who capt vated St. Augustine in his youth, promising that they di not ask faith unless 'they made the truth clear and evi dent.' Divisions and dissensions hinder growth in grace, fo the whole body should be 'fitly joined together and com pacted.' It is the duty of kings, as nursing fathers, an queens, as nursing mothers of the Church, to put an end t divisions, and to remove 'pests.' St. Paul recommend Timothy to withdraw himself from men that are given t perverse disputings, and to reject heretics. Heresies ar injurious, not only to the Church but also to the State Constantine experienced this when he complained that h could not go to war with Persia because of the heresy o Arius.

Shows that toleration only increases schismatics.

So far Dr. Perrinchief has proved the mischief done b schismatics. He then shows that toleration only increase the perverse generation. Julian the Apostate knew thi when he gave 'public liberty to all and every sect of th Galileans.' One of his courtiers, Ammianus Marcellinus says that 'he did this with so much the more industry, tha toleration and licence increasing their dissensions, he nee not for the time to come fear that people would agree to gether, he having had experience that no beasts are mor savage to men than most of the *Dissenting* Christians ar to one another.' The same results are found in the histor of the Donatists. No sooner did Constantine give them tole ration, than their followers, the Circumcelliones, went throug the towns and villages resisting the governors of provinces delivering debtors from creditors, setting slaves free fro their masters, and many other acts of injustice. But whe Honorius made severe laws against them, the fiercest of the Circumcelliones, as St. Augustine tells the heretic Vincentius, 'became manifestly good Catholics, and condemnec their former conversation and miserable error.' But fo toleration, we should never have heard of such sects a Seekers and Quakers. Perrinchief adds that sectaries can not be classed with Conformists as peaceable subjects, bu must be excluded from toleration as enemies of the govern ment, on the same ground that we exclude Catholics. In

continuation of the controversy, Perrinchief proved that toleration was opposed by Christ and His Apostles, by the first Christians, by all Christian emperors in the first ages of Christianity, and by all emperors of modern times. Necessity alone, he said, could justify it, and a standing army would be necessary to make it safe.*

Herbert Thorndike answers John Corbet.

Thorndike also denied that the Presbyterians were good subjects. It is often difficult to find out his meaning, for his arguments are generally obscure, and his language sometimes unintelligible. The scope of the treatise seems to be that as Latitudinarianism was becoming strong in the Universities, and threatening to inundate the Church, we could get no help from the Presbyterians. Their tendencies were all in the same direction. This was proved from the writings of Episcopius, in which the Trinity and original sin were regarded as open questions. To comprehend the Presbyterians, would be to give them equal authority with 'the Catholic Church.' It would be opening the door for the influx of heresies worse than theirs, and these would 'make hay in the sunshine.' The proper remedy is to enforce 'the Catholic faith,' and the laws of 'the primitive Church within the first six General Councils.' It is the business of those in authority to compel all parties to stand to that on which the primitive Church was agreed.†

Archbishop Sheldon's patronage of the intolerant clergy.

These writers were protected and promoted by Archbishop Sheldon, who wrote no books, but who never scrupled to identify himself with the narrowest Conformists, and never faltered in his opposition to every class of Dissenters. His next chaplain after Tomkyns was the notorious Samuel Parker, who died Bishop of Oxford under the second James. Parker had been originally an Independent and a virulent enemy of the Church. He came over to the Conformists, but he brought his virulence with him, which was changed only as to the objects against whom it was directed. In 1670 he published his 'Discourse of Ecclesiastical Polity.' In

* Corbet wrote 'A Second Discourse of the Religion of England,' and Perrinchief 'A Continuation of the Discourse of Toleration; or, Indulgence not justified,' which contained also an answer to a tract called 'A Peace Offering, or Plea for Indulgence.'

† The 'Dolus an Virtus?' did not deal in argument, its substance was expressed in the motto, *Væ vobis hypocritæ!*

CHAP. VII.

the full title it is described as a defence 'of the authority o the civil magistrate over the consciences of his subjects i matters of religion.' It promises also to set forth 'the mis chief and inconveniences of toleration,' and to answer 'a protests pleaded in behalf of liberty of conscience.' Th doctrine usually ascribed to Hobbes, that all distinction between right and wrong have their origin in the will of th prince is carefully disowned. Conscience and the civil ma gistrate are both pronounced to be vicegerents of God. I any case where right is clear, conscience is to oblige befor all laws civil or ecclesiastical. While stating these propo sitions Parker complains of the pretences of conscience. I claims an absolute and unlimited power over the actions o human life. He calls it the greatest of all disturbers o government. When subjects rebel against their sovereign they plead conscience. They have even put kings to death under the guidance of their conscience; it is the great author of rebellion in the State and of heresy and schism i the Church. Let authority command what it may, unde the pretence of conscience men do what they list. If th power of the prince is not to be above this pretence, the the authority of the prince will cease to be supreme. Fo the peace and tranquillity of a commonwealth, it is necessary that religion be subject to the authority of the sovereign. Christianity, in all probability, would have been destroyed but for the wisdom of Constantine in checking tumults and seditions among Christian sects. Till the Bishop of Rome usurped one-half of the jurisdiction, the Church was well governed by the vigilance of the emperors. In the times of the Apostles the lack of civil jurisdiction was supplied by miracles; Church censures were then followed by immediate divine punishments. One of the first principles of the Reformation was the reassertion of the civil power in matters of religion. This was done in all the Reformed Churches, but especially in the Church of England. Those who deny this power under pretence of being led by the Spirit, Parker calls 'pragmatical divines.' The civil magistrate has power to enforce laws of morality, from which it is inferred that he must also have power to enforce ritual. The ground of this inference is, that with the rude

Samuel Parker protests against the claims of conscience.

CHAP. VII.

Shows the danger to the State from toleration of different religions.

multitude superstition is a greater enemy to God than licentiousness. To permit different sects of religion in a commonwealth is only to make so many occasions for public disturbance, religious factions being ever the most seditious.

Hobbes' doctrine, according to Parker, was injurious, because it denied the existence of Deity. But the civil magistrate finds religion of great service to the government of a State. There is no fear so vehement as the fear of hell; there are no hopes so powerful as the hopes of heaven. These have infinitely greater force to deter men from evil than any interests that are merely secular. The practical conclusion to which Parker comes is, that if the Nonconformists have weak and tender consciences, they should cast the responsibility on those who have authority in Church and State. For the well-being of a commonwealth it is absolutely necessary that men's consciences be governed. Differences of religion should not be tolerated; and uniformity should be enforced on the same principle that laws are made for ordering all 'the other affairs and transactions of human life.'

Bishop Croft's 'Naked Truth.'

It would be a libel on the Church of England to suppose that it was ever fairly represented by such men as Gilbert Sheldon, Samuel Parker, or Herbert Thorndike. Within the Church there were many anxious for the comprehension of Nonconformists, and willing to leave, as indifferent, all the points about which they scrupled. In 1675, Herbert Croft, Bishop of Hereford, appeared as 'An Humble Moderator,' in a book which he called 'The Naked Truth, or the True State of the Primitive Church.' The Bishop told the Lords and Commons that all their zeal for enforcing uniformity had visibly failed; it was now time to try some other method than compulsion. He proposed, as the sole confession of faith, the Apostles' Creed. It was sufficient for the primitive Church and it ought to be sufficient for us. Philip asked the Ethiopian eunuch for nothing more than the confession that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. Enforced subscriptions to articles of faith might be well meant, but the history of the Church testifies that they have done nothing but evil. A plain commandment is broken to establish what, after all, is only a doubtful truth. The Scrip-

CHAP. VII.

ture, the Bishop said, is itself a complete rule of fai
Without the help of formularies, it is able to make men wi
unto salvation. We appeal to the Fathers, but we forg
that many of the Fathers had been philosophers, and h
brought into the Gospel their 'school terms and dearl
beloved sciences.' St. Paul foresaw this when he warn
Christians against 'philosophy and vain deceit.' Consta
tine at one time intended to forbid the use in Christiani
of all terms not derived from Scripture. Had he do
what he intended, the Arian heresy would have expire
and we should never have heard either of Homoousian
Homoiousian.

The Fathers not to be followed as authorities.

Bishop Croft thinks that our Reformers being educat
in the Church of Rome, had an undue reverence for th
judgment of the Fathers. They were disposed to adm
their authority for three or four centuries, some for five
six. This brought them into great difficulties in their co
troversies with Roman Catholics. It would have been wis
if they had claimed the same right of judging for then
selves which the old Fathers claimed. Cyprian, for instanc
says that a bishop is to be guided by his own reason an
conscience, being responsible for his doctrines to God onl
Augustine says that he submits to no doctor of the Churcl
be he ever so learned or ever so holy, any further than h
proves his doctrine by Scripture or by reason. And he ask
that other men would do the same as to his teaching. A
strict adherence to the Fathers, the Bishop adds, was nc
necessary in controversies with Roman Catholics. There i
no Father from whom they do not differ on some point
The Fathers were as liable to err as we are. Two of th
earliest of them—Papias and Irenæus—were Millenarian
Augustine erred in some of the things concerning which h
was most confident, as the necessity of baptism and th
Lord's Supper for the salvation of infants, and his certaint
that there were no antipodes. As to Councils, if the late
erred, as all our Reformers said, why not the earlier also
The gates of hell shall not indeed prevail against the Church
but where is it said that they shall not prevail against
General Councils? On the contrary, the Scriptures tell us
that in the days of Antichrist the true Church shall be driven

ıto the wilderness and shall scarcely be visible by the CHAP. VII.
'orld.

As to ceremonies, the Bishop wonders that any could be ɜalous either for or against them. He took up the usual round, that in matters indifferent we should obey our ılers as children obey their parents. Yet he said it was ıe duty of rulers, as well as of parents, not to provoke their hildren to wrath. The Apostles complied with Jewish pre-ıdices in abstaining from things strangled. Our Reformers n the same principle wisely retained the surplice, not to ıake too great changes in the externals of worship. But ow, zeal for the surplice when people are generally against ːs use, 'savours more of passion than of religion in the go-ernors of the Church.'* The Church should be built on a ɔck, and not on the sand of ceremonies. The body is more ıan meat. The substance is more than the shadow. orce, it was maintained, should never be used in religion, ɤcept against those who troubled the State. It was im-ɔssible to make men really believe contrary to their convic-ons. To compel the observance of mere ceremonies made eople more violent against them, because they suspected hat something was intended which was not apparent.†

The Church should be built on a rock and not on ceremonies.

On the side of the Nonconformists, John Wilson, one of

* To the plea that the white sur-ice was an emblem of righteousness, .e Bishop answered, 'Not surely such irty nasty surplices as some of them ear, especially the singers in the athedral.'

† 'Naked Truth' was answered by amuel Parker in 1676. Parker's ehemence evoked the satire of An-rew Marvel. His 'Polity' had been idiculed in 'The Rehearsal Trans-osed.' The 'Animadversions on Naked Truth' were now made the ıbject of a humorous treatise, called Mr. Smirke, or the Divine in Mode.' Of Bishop Croft's book, Marvel says hat it is impossible for any one to ead it without wishing that he were he author of it. Parker he cannot reat with seriousness. It is conjec-ured that he is employed by the au-ıorities of the Church to amuse the ıity, on the same principle that some ılers provide public entertainments to keep the people from thinking about the affairs of government. Marvel says that of late years the clergy have afforded the public con-siderable pastime, and that they con-tinue to supply the press with books, of which the arguments are rare and ridiculous. It was noticed by Dryden that the controversy had returned to the days of Elizabeth, when Mar-tin Mar-Prelate performed the part which Marvel does now.

'Naked Truth' was also answered by Dr. Turner, Master of St. John's, Cambridge, afterwards Bishop of Ely. Dr. Gunning, at that time Bishop of Ely, preached against it in a sermon before the King. Dr. Fell, Bishop of Oxford, wrote against it 'Lex Talionis, or the Author of Naked Truth Stript Naked.' Bishop Croft was compared to Judas. He said to Episcopacy 'Hail, Master!' and then betrayed it.

CHAP. VII.

John Wilson's 'Nehushtan.'

the ejected ministers, published in 1668, 'Nehushta a Sober and Peaceable Discourse concerning the Abolitic of Things abused to Superstition and Idolatry.' At a earlier period this would have been reckoned a valuab book, but the arguments had all already done good servic Hezekiah destroyed the brazen serpent, calling it Nehushta or a lump of brass. From this it was argued that the rule in Church and State have authority to prohibit, in the publ worship of God, the use of things that have been abused idolatry. It was easy to mention many things in the prim tive Church, as the love-feasts and the holy kiss, that ha been discontinued because they had been abused. It wa also easy to quote from the great writers of the Englis Church many passages which inculcated the principle th idolatrous ceremonies should be renounced, however an cient or venerable. Jewel, Hooker, Morton, Abbot, th Homilies and authorized documents of the Church, are a clear on this point. But no one, either Conformist or Pu ritan, had ever been able to draw the line of demarcatio between the things that were to be retained and thos which were to be rejected. The Christian religion itsel had been abused to superstition, and he only that rejecte it was a thorough Puritan. The Churches themselves ha been polluted with Roman rites. The Church bells ha been used to summon people to the idolatry of the Mass The font had been defiled with incantations in baptism and the pulpit profaned by the presence of a mass priest Why then should not Church and Church bells, pulpi and font, go the way of cope and surplice, kneelin and crossing? They have all been abused to idolatry and some modern Hezekiah may call them 'Nehushtan. John Wilson, indeed, touches the nerve of the controversy when he comes to the question why the Lord's Supper i not to be abolished, though it has been abused to superstition. The brazen serpent was erected by command of God It cured the people in the days of Moses; yet when they burnt incense to it in the time of Hezekiah, it was taken down and called Nehushtan. In the doctrine and worship of the Church of Rome, there is nothing which has been so thoroughly perverted from its original meaning, or made

The Lord's Supper abused to superstition, why not abolished?

ıe instrument of superstition and idolatry as the Lord's upper. Yet no Puritan has proposed on this account to ..ɔolish it. Wilson's answer is that it was intended by Christ for a permanent institution. This is the best answer ıat can be given. Yet the difficulty covers the whole ırface of the controversy. If the most evidently divine institution of the Christian religion has been most abused, ho will draw the line between things to be retained and ..ıings to be abolished?

Simon Patrick's 'Friendly Debate.'

Simon Patrick's 'Friendly Debate between a Conformist ıd a Nonconformist' was published in 1669. It was a ~eneral debate on the questions of conformity, with answers) 'Nehushtan' and other Puritan works. Patrick was at ıis time a popular preacher in London, and Rector of t. Paul's, Covent Garden, where he had succeeded Thomas .anton. The 'Friendly Debate' was not worthy of the ɜn who had been the intimate friend of John Smith, of ɜmbridge. But in those days abusive polemics were not .compatible with the most ardent piety. The beginning ' the dialogue sufficiently indicates the tone and character ' the whole book. The Conformist tells the Noncon- rmist, that as there was no law made by Christ which ɔmpelled him to live within five miles of a market town, ne ought not therefore to break the law of the land as :pressed in the 'Five-Mile Act.' This is really said sin- ırely. It is no burlesque of the principle of obedience to ıem that are above us. If the rulers in Church and State ɜy that we ought not to live within five miles of a market ..wn, and Christ does not say the contrary, then we ought) obey. Patrick wrote 'A Continuation' and 'A Further ontinuation' of his debate, in which he answered many)ponents.* He went over the whole ground of the contro- ɜrsy, quoting and refuting all the Puritan authors since the time of Thomas Cartwright. Calvinism is unfairly ..entified with Antinomianism, and the name flung at all ıritans. So early did the great Churchmen forget that e Conformists never had any difference with the Puritans ı doctrine, and especially in reference to the doctrines of ılvin. In the dialogue the Nonconformist is represented

* The most important was 'Philagathus.'

CHAP. VII.

as following an experimental or internal conviction, which he calls 'the demonstration of the Spirit.' He opposes the spiritual to the rational, saying that he can only hear those preachers who have seen with their eyes and heard with their ears and handled with their hands the Word of Life

Patrick forgets the lessons he learned at Cambridge.

Patrick, in defiance of the lessons he had learned at Cambridge, explains 'the demonstration of the Spirit' as the evidence of miracles. He makes ridicule of the inward conviction, excludes it as an evidence for truth, and seems to rest Christianity entirely on outward facts which are beyond the reach of experience.

But all these controversies were insignificant compared with that which began with Stillingfleet. In 1680 he preached a sermon before the Lord Mayor, in the Guildhall

Stillingfleet on 'The Mischief of Separation.'

on 'The Mischief of Separation.' Stillingfleet was at this time Dean of St. Paul's. It gave greater offence to the Nonconformists, from the circumstance that the preacher was reckoned one of the most liberal divines of the Church. He had taken an active part, along with Tillotson, in drawing up the last Scheme of Comprehension, which, from the dread of Roman Catholicism, had been eagerly supported by both parties. In his youth, before the Restoration, while Rector of Sutton, in Cambridgeshire, he had written

His 'Irenicum.'

an 'Irenicum,' a work which had fairly been classed with Jeremy Taylor's 'Liberty of Prophesying.' It might be difficult to show any real difference of sentiment between the 'Sermon' and the 'Irenicum.' But in the 'Sermon' he has to deal with the fact of a separation, the blame of which he charges upon the Nonconformists. On their own showing, their objections to conformity were not, he said, of sufficient weight to warrant separation. So far as opinion and practice were concerned, Stillingfleet did not think it would be difficult to compose their differences. But in addition to these there was the strength of prejudice, which he found it impossible to overcome.

The text of the sermon was Phil. iii. 16, 'Let us walk by the same rule.' The preacher said that the occasion of St. Paul's writing was the danger of a schism in the Church of Antioch. The Gentile Christians had been forced either into a compliance with the Jews or into a perpetual

schism. Paul and Barnabas had been carried away with the dissimulation. The same false apostles who had wrought these evils at Antioch were now at Philippi. St. Paul beseeches the Philippians not to give way to divisions. He tells them to beware of dogs, that is, the preachers of circumcision. He supposes a certain fixed rule, and the necessity of all Christians following it, notwithstanding their different attainments. This is applied to the Nonconformists. If they knew the necessity of following the one rule, as conscientious men they would not live in known sin, that is, schism, which is explained, not as the separation of different churches, that is, of the churches of different countries from each other, but as the separation of some in one country from the Church of that country. The case of the nonconforming ministers might be reckoned hard. But this cannot be said of the case of the people. They are not required to give 'assent and consent' to all and everything in the Prayer Book. They may object to certain rites, and refuse to conform to them. This would be harmless. But it is quite another matter when they form separated congregations under other teachers.

Schism defined.

It is this sinful and mischievous separation which is schism. It was shown that those who separate have no fault to find with the doctrine of the Church. They admit that our parochial churches are true churches, and that communion with them is not unlawful. The plea is, that their separation is not a sin; in fact, that their meeting in different places is really not a separation. The Apostles, Stillingfleet says, placed their converts under the care of the bishops and deacons. In the ancient canons the idea of a church was always that of a diocese. Presbyters who rejected the authority of the bishops became schismatics. The Nonconformists deny that their separation is a schism, and yet they preach when and where they like, without regard to the law of the Church. They administer the sacraments in a different manner from that which the Church prescribes; yet they say there is no separation, or, at least, not such a separation as constitutes schism. This, the preacher said, is far from ingenuous dealing. No cause was ever worse defended. They admit that it is lawful to hold communion with the

Nonconformists agree with the Church in doctrine.

CHAP. VII.

Church, and yet they separate and go about to vindicate th separated ministry from the guilt of schism. Tenderness c conscience might be pleaded for scruples, but not surely fc deliberate separation. The sermon ends with some goo advice to Nonconformists.

The advice was not valued nor the arguments appreciated The sermon was answered immediately by Baxter, Owen Alsop, and many others, including an answer by 'Som Nonconformists.' They did not all argue from the sam standpoint. The sermon was really directed against Baxte and those who, like him, were unwilling to be considere separatists from the Church of England. Baxter was at thi time an occasional preacher at Pinner's Hall and other place in the neighbourhood of St. Paul's. Immediately on the pub lication of this sermon he addressed to Stillingfleet a series c questions, which embraced a defence of his past and presen conduct as a nonconforming minister of the National Churcl He denied altogether that he took the same ground a the old Nonconformists. They were Presbyterians in th proper sense of that word. They were exclusive and scru pulous about trifles. They would have made the Churc narrower had that been in their power. But Baxter an the majority of the Nonconformists of his time asked 'a Catholic union on the broad basis of the essentials of Chris tianity on which they were all agreed.' When the minister met at Sion College, in the time of the Savoy Conference they asked, Baxter says, nothing but Archbishop Ussher' scheme of Episcopacy, with more freedom in the use of th Liturgy. They were met by the Act of Uniformity, which made conformity more difficult than it had ever been. 'I am past doubt,' he exclaims, 'but Richard Hooker, Bisho Bilson, Archbishop Ussher, and such others, were they now alive, would be Nonconformists.' Stillingfleet and Baxte held similar views as to the exercise of the civil power in th province of religion. They both agreed in the duty of obeyin the magistrate within certain limits, though these limits wer never well defined. They both agreed also in the divine in stitution of a ministry in the Church, with a commission, whicl no civil magistrate could either give or take away. Baxte pleaded that he could not submit to the 'impositions, and

Baxter's answer to Stillingfleet.

Conformity made more difficult by the Act of Uniformity.

e could not be silent.' There were parishes in London ith populations as large as sixty thousand, far beyond the ach of the ministrations of the conforming clergy. He was a 'ordained minister.' He could not be silent, and it was sacrilege' that he should be put aside. He was willing to e regarded as Stillingfleet's curate, working without reward mong those who were not reached by the ordinary parohial clergy. As one 'standing on the verge of the grave,' e expresses his wonder how any man, under these circumances, could justify the silencing of the ejected ministers.

Stillingfleet charges Baxter with 'the sin of schism.'

Stillingfleet answered that Baxter's separation was properly schism, and, therefore, it was sin. The Nonconrmists confessed that the doctrines of the Church were ood and agreeable to the word of God, and yet they upeld separate meetings. The plea of supplying the lack of e administrations of the parochial clergy was not admitted. he meetings were intended for opposition. The main arument derived from ordination was easily settled. The hurch, Stillingfleet said, always had power to reduce shops and presbyters to lay communion. If those who ve been legally silenced are to go on preaching, all authoty in Church and State will be at an end. It was never ident whether disobeying the authority of the Church or at of the State was the 'formal reason' of the sin of the onconformists. One of the questions which Baxter asked as concerning 'the constitutive regent part' of the Naonal Church. Was it the king or a sacerdotal head? He uld not determine whether the 'same rule' by which all ere to walk was to be some decree of the civil ruler some unmistakable principle of the Christian Church. illingfleet spoke in general terms of obeying authority. axter reduced his arguments to three heads,—that it is e business of the magistrate to choose what persons the ople shall hear, in what words the ministers shall pray, what books they shall assent, and that those who do t obey are sinful schismatics. Against this Erastianism axter argues from the incapacity of the magistrates to oose the ministers of religion, quoting the custom of the cient Church, which never suffered a bishop to be elected the magistrates without the consent of the clergy. The

CHAP. VII.

magistrate may silence a minister, and the silencing may b unjust as well as just. But what, he asks, is this 'rule' b which we are all to walk? He gives twelve interpretation of the text, specially rejecting the one which makes th 'rule' the will of the magistrate. He adds, that it canno surely be the Act of Uniformity. By that Act the Noncon formists were thrust out of the Church. If it be the rule then the sin of schism would consist simply in disobeying command about religion which no man has authority to give.

John Owen answers Stillingfleet.

Owen's 'Vindication of the Nonconformists from th Charge of Schism,' was not written precisely from th same standpoint as Baxter's. He was, however, agree with Baxter and Stillingfleet that, as regards doctrine, a the 'sober Protestant people of England were of one mind And this itself was a reason in ordinary prudence for mutu forbearance. To the general principles of Stillingfleet sermon, he had no special objections. They might serv either party until it was determined on which side the blam of the separation rested. Drawing his argument from th text, Owen said that St. Paul had before him the differenc between the Jewish converts and the believing Gentile The Conformists were likened to the Jews, who wished t impose on the Gentiles rites that had not been commande by Christ. The Gentiles did not wish to have these rite imposed. 'We,' Owen says, 'desire nothing but wha the churches of the Gentiles desired of old as the only mean to prevent division: namely, that they might not be im posed on to observe those things which they were not satisfie that it was the mind of Christ they should observe.' S Paul recommended 'an open door for peace and quietness and his advice is applicable to us. As a Congregationalis Owen could not see why individual churches could not h separate as well as national churches, without being charg able with 'the sin of schism.' If Stillingfleet could sho him what the 'rule' really is, and where it is prescribed b Christ or His Apostles, he would answer for the willingnes of the Nonconformists to follow it.

* In his later years Baxter entered more fully into the spirit of the Church of England as a national establishment, not justifying the Act of Uniformity, yet advocating the authority of th civil ruler in religion. See his boo 'Of National Churches,' noticed Vol. I. p. 269 of the present work.

CHAP. VII.

'Some Nonconformists' answer Stillingfleet.

The answer to Stillingfleet's sermon by 'Some Nonconformists,' was even more latitudinarian than those of Baxter and Owen. The authors subjoined 'a scheme of union, or materials for a bill which would heal both parties.' Some of them were Congregationalists, but they were all agreed to come within the pale of the National Church, and acknowledge the civil ruler as the supreme head in all things ecclesiastical as well as civil. They could not set aside their character as ministers of Christ. Necessity was laid upon them to preach the Gospel, and they must obey God rather than man. They sought unity, but if it could only be obtained at the expense of silence, they had no choice. Public worship and preaching the gospel were divine institutions, but the order of parish churches was only by human law. They accepted the axiom of John Hales, 'that it is not the refuser, but the imposer, who is guilty of schism.' The Act of Uniformity enforced re-ordination and declaration of 'assent and consent' to all and everything in the Book of Common Prayer. But to submit to re-ordination, was to say that they were not already ordained. It was to sanction a principle which had been repudiated by many eminent bishops of the Church of England, and which involved the exclusion from communion of the Reformed Churches abroad. No agreement, it was said, could be made while an 'unfeigned assent' was required to the creed of St. Athanasius. They could not say of the whole Greek Church, that all its members would everlastingly perish. They could not give 'unfeigned consent' to the article which seems to deny the possibility of salvation to the virtuous heathen. In the service for the fifth of November there is a prayer for the three estates of the realm, though it is a question, undecided, which are the three estates? Some say the King, Lords and Commons; others say the Commons, with the Lords spiritual and temporal. In the revised Liturgy, the bishops are made an order distinct from the presbyters. This is contrary to the judgment of all the great authorities on Church government. Such men as Davenant, Ussher, Field, and Mason would now be ejected as Nonconformists. The writers had formerly been zealous against many of the things now imposed, which

CHAP. VII.

'Assent and consent' scarcely to be given even to the Bible.

was a special difficulty in the way of their giving 'unfeigne consent.' The rigid use of the words 'assent and consent seemed a device to make conformity impossible for thos who had been opposed to the impositions. They doubted they could give 'assent and consent' to everything even i the Bible itself, certainly not to any two versions of i They could not give 'unfeigned consent' to the version Psalm cv. 28, in King James' Bible, and at the same tim to that in the Prayer Book. In the former it reads, 'The rebelled not against His word,' and in the latter 'They wer not obedient to His word.'

The 'Congregational Brethren' plead for a Broad National Church.

In the scheme of union, even the 'Congregationa Brethren' were willing to be comprehended within th Church as National. It was asked that the King and Pa liament would sanction 'their separate meetings by a law as his Majesty did by his Declaration.' This they said woul be enough to constitute them integral parts of the Nationa Church. 'The Congregational Churches would then ow the King for head over them.' The civil power woul keep 'every several congregation to that gospel order them selves profess,' and supervise their constitution in things in different. It was suggested that a general approval of th contents of the Prayer Book might take the place o 'assent and consent' and that the Articles and Homilies might be open to any fair interpretation. This was explained as an interpretation which any learned expositor may give them. The object of this modification of subscription to the Articles, was to give Calvinists and Arminians an equal standing within the Church. The ministers were willing to submit to re-ordination provided the bishops explained this ordination as for the exercise of their office in new charge.*

* Vincent Alsop wrote, 'The Mischief of Impositions.' This was a brisk pamphlet, but the arguments are not to be mentioned. John Howe wrote a long letter concerning Stillingfleet's sermon. It was addressed to 'A Person of Quality in the City, who took offence at the Sermon.' Howe states the case in some calm, plain words. There were many pastors who had scruples about conformity, and there were many people who would not worship at all if they were not allowed to worship in separate meetings. By Stillingfleet's own statement, it appears that the people were more opposed to the disputed ceremonies than the nonconforming ministers. Multitudes in conscience regarded them as 'sinful,' so that they had either to act against their conscience or be separate. It was difficult for them to see the 'sin' of separation when they were not con

CHAP. VII.

Stillingfleet on the 'Unreasonableness of Separation.'

Stillingfleet answered his many adversaries in a long treaise, called 'The Unreasonableness of Separation.' What he said of his opponents seemed to be true on both sides: They profess to bring water to quench the flames, but they only add fuel to the fire.' This was not done willingly. It was the result of the inheritance which they had from the doings of violent men. Had they started with the ground clear, reconciliation might have been easy. But liberal and zealous for the peace of the Church as both sides were, the circumstances in which they were placed made them regard each other as bitter enemies. Stillingfleet said that Baxter seemed 'resolved to leave his life and sting together in the wounds of the Church.' He likened himself to Bishop Jewel, who, after all his labours in defence of Protestantism, received nothing but abuse from the Nonconformists. He haunted the Dissenters as being in league with Roman Catholics against the Church of England. Their dislike of the liturgy and of cathedral services was derived from the Jesuits, who by the constitution of their order are excused from attending cathedral worship. It was the Jesuits who set up extempore praying and enthusiastic preaching, and from them these things were learned by the Puritans. Stillingfleet filled long pages with statements of this kind, which may have been believed in his day, and which certainly had a great influence in converting individual Dissenters to the Church. Conformity might not be agreeable to the Puritans, but contact with the Church of Rome was the greatest of abominations. When they looked to their own case it was hard, but the national establishment appeared to them all as a mighty bulwark against the Papacy. They wished to be of it. No Puritan, except an occasional Brownist, ever advocated separation for its own sake. Stillingfleet made use of this against the Nonconformists of his time. Calvin and Beza had used their influence to prevent a separation of the Puritans from the Church of England. Thomas Cartwright wrote strongly against the separation of Browne

The Old Puritans opposed to separation.

convinced that authority had been given to the rulers in every national Church to appoint ceremonies, the observance of which was binding on all the people of the nation. Howe thinks the Act of Uniformity was well meant and had a good object, but it had so visibly failed that even in the judgment of its promoters it must be regarded as virtually obsolete.

CHAP. VII.

and Harrison. But though the old Puritans were so zealous against a separation, they had, according to Stillingfleet, the same reasons for it as the Nonconformists after the Restoration. But this was scarcely true. It was the new impositions of 1662 which constituted the strongest plea on the side of the Nonconformist.*

'The Conformists' Pleas for the Nonconformists

There were many writers on the Church side who were disposed to make great allowance for those who objected to the new impositions. Among these are specially to be noticed the author of several tracts called 'The Conformists' Pleas for the Nonconformists' and Dr. Whitby, who wrote 'The Protestant Reconciler' under the name of 'A Well-Wisher of the Church's Peace and a Lamenter of her Sad Divisions.' The author of the 'Pleas' gives significance to what must ever be regarded as the true defence of the Nonconformists of that time. 'There were,' he says, 'cross-bars put up to keep them out of the Church, and whilst these cross-bars remain, it is vain for Churchmen to send forth exhortations to unity.' It was stated plainly, that for eighteen years their sufferings had been great and their forbearance commendable. It was their peculiar hardship that 'they were ejected in a time of joy all over the land, and after an Act of Oblivion, when all parties pretended to be reconciled and made friends.' Archbishop Bramhall had

* The 'Unreasonableness of Separation' was answered by a host of writers, some new and some old. Baxter wrote 'A Search for the English Schismatic,' which was meant to prove that all Nonconformists were not schismatics. He wrote also 'A Second Defence of the Mere Nonconformists,' and in the same year 'An Apology for the Nonconformists' Ministry.' This contained, besides many arguments already advanced, answers to the bishops who had been the chief promoters of the ejection of the Nonconformists. It also proposed reasons for 'endeavouring their restoration.' It is dedicated to Compton, Bishop of London, Barlow, Bishop of Lincoln, Croft of Hereford, Rainbow of Carlisle, Thomas of St. David's, Lloyd of Peterborough, and 'as many more as are of their moderation and love of our common peace and concord.' One reason urged for moderation towards Nonconformists is their near agreement with the Church and their desire not to be separated from it. 'A few years ago,' Baxter says, 'a Puritan was one who was against bishops, ceremonies, and liturgy, and a Presbyterian was one who was for lay elders, and the power of classes;' but 'now, in England, a Puritan is one that is no more against, and as much for, archbishops, bishops, liturgy and ceremonies as in my books I have long published myself to be.' A Presbyterian, he adds, is now against lay elders and the ruling power of presbyteries and synods. He only asks that these be consulted, and that they may share the governing power with the archbishops and bishops.

called the 'Articles of Religion' Articles of Peace. This was done to open the door for the High Church Arminians. But the latitude given to them was denied to the Nonconformists. Baxter had asked a clause of explanation, that by 'assent and consent' was only meant 'as to the use of the book.' The Lords were willing that such a clause should be added, but it was rejected by the Commons.* The old Nonconformists had never been treated with the severity of those of 1662. Whitgift complained that his treatment of the Nonconformists had been unjustly exaggerated. Even Bancroft provided for the maintenance of some of the ministers whom he deprived. This author says, that in the time of Charles I. conformity was not rigidly enforced. This was doubtless true during the Primacy of Abbot, and in many of the dioceses even to the death of Laud. It is added, that the severities of the Presbyterians under the Commonwealth were not so great as report made them. They tolerated all who were 'tolerable,' reserving punishment only for the 'heretical.'

Dr. Whitby's 'Protestant Reconciler.'

Dr. Whitby said that the things imposed should never have been made a condition of communion. But once imposed the Nonconformists should have yielded. It is remarked, that though Stillingfleet says a great deal against resisting impositions, yet he says very little which tends to justify them. The Dissenters, on the other hand, say a great deal about the impositions, but fail to show that it is altogether unlawful to refuse submission to them. The Preface to the Book of Common Prayer speaks of ceremonies as things indifferent. Jesus set no value on mere ritual. He endorsed the words of Hosea, that mercy is better than sacrifice. It was prophesied of Jesus by the evangelical prophet that 'He shall not break the bruised reed.' All the governors of the Church should be of this spirit. Like St. Paul, they should be 'all things to all men.' Dr. Whitby quoted many things to the same effect from Stillingfleet's 'Irenicum;' adding, that perhaps Dr. Stillingfleet 'can now answer these arguments,' for, said Dr. Whitby, 'I am sure I cannot.'

* Macaulay says, 'The House of Commons was, during some years, more zealous for royalty than the King, more zealous for Episcopacy than the Bishops.'—'History of England,' vol. i. p. 175.

CHAP. VII.

The second part is addressed to the Nonconformist laity. They had no subscriptions to make, and therefore had not the same difficulty as the ministers. They were exhorted to do what they could do in conscience to heal the divisions of the Church. Christ attended the regular worship of His country, though there were many things in the Jewish Church of merely human origin. This fact had so perplexed the first Puritans, that William Ames supposed an extraordinary revelation, on the authority of which all ceremonies were instituted. This, as Whitby truly judged, was but a supposition. The Puritan text, afterwards appropriated by High Churchmen, about Moses being faithful over his house, was easily dealt with. The Jews had a living judge of controversies. The rulers appointed the ceremonies. The Puritans put the Scriptures in the place of the living judge. Henry Jeanes, writing against Dr. Hammond, says that 'Scripture is a perfect adequate and complete rule of ceremonies, as well as worship.' Dr. Whitby pronounces this 'a false assumption.' The rule is imperfect, and in fact prescribes nothing.*

The Scriptures not a rule for ceremonies.

Henry Dodwell on 'Separation from Episcopal Churches.'

The last writer on this controversy whom it is necessary to mention is Henry Dodwell. His treatise on 'Separation from Episcopal Churches' represents the view of a party which has at least the merit of being logically consistent.

* The following curious recantation was imposed on Whitby by his patron, Bishop Ward. Of Whitby's sincerity in reading it we cannot speak. 'Oct. 9, 1683. I, Daniel Whitby, Doctor of Divinity, Chancellor of the Church of Sarum and Rector of the parish Church of St. Edmund's in the city and diocese of Sarum, having been the author of a book called 'The Protestant Reconciler,' which, through want of prudence and *deference to authority*, I have caused to be printed and published, am truly and heartily sorry for the same, and for any evil influence it hath had upon the Dissenters from the Church of England established by law or others; and whereas it containeth several passages which I am convinced in my conscience are *obnoxious to the canons* and do reflect upon the governors of the said Church, I do hereby openly revoke and renounce all *irreverent* and *unmeet* expressions contained therein, by which I have justly incurred the censure or displeasure of my superiors: and furthermore, whereas these two propositions have been deduced and concluded from the said book, viz. (1) That it is not lawful for superiors to impose anything in the worship of God that is not antecedently necessary; (2) The duty of not offending a weak brother is inconsistent with all human authority of making laws concerning indifferent things, I do hereby openly renounce both the said propositions, being false, erroneous, and schismatical, and do revoke and disclaim *all* tenets, positions, and assertions in the said book *from whence these positions* can be inferred; and *wheresoever* I have offended therein, I do humbly beg pardon of God and the Church for the same.'

Stillingfleet, and all the moderate Conformists, spoke much of obeying the rulers in Church and State. The only limit they set to obedience was, when authority imposed idolatrous worship, such as that of the Church of Rome. But the multitude of men were lost in the borderland. Who was to determine the precise point at which obedience should cease? Some men's consciences stopped only at the impositions of the Church of Rome, but the consciences of some other men could not submit to the impositions of the Church of the Restoration. Dodwell said that we are to obey the Church in whatever it imposes. A Church is co-extensive with a nation. The Episcopacy of a nation constitutes a national Church, and with the bishops it stands or falls. Here, then, the case is clear against Nonconformists. To be separate from an Episcopal Church is to be outside of the covenant of mercy, and to be aliens from the Christian Commonwealth. 'Where the bishop is, there is the ark of safety. Where the bishop is not, the floods of Divine wrath may any moment sweep away the generations of men. Separation from the bishop is a clear and tangible definition of schism. Those who are guilty of it cease to be able to administer valid rites or sacraments. To disobey the bishop is to despise the very principles of government, which is more than to violate particular laws.

The Bishop constitutes the Church.

In accordance with the doctrine of securing the 'main chance,' Dodwell recommends adherence to the Episcopal Church so long as outside of it there is the least possibility of missing salvation. It is the highest maxim of human prudence, that wherever there is any uncertainty we should 'keep on the securer side.' That this is the safer way is proved by many arguments. One is, that membership of a visible, that is, an Episcopal Church, is a better evidence of salvation than any good works done by those outside of the Church. This, at least, is certain, that a good life and Church membership are safer than a good life and separation from the Church. The Church is the ordinary way of salvation. There may be extraordinary ways, but in them the chances must be less. In the Church we have 'the legal conveyance of the heavenly inheritance.' This is all connected with a theology which regards reason and

CHAP. VII.

philosophy as profane adversaries of the Church and the bishops. Dodwell says that God is concerned to have His will performed just because it is His will. He does not choose to save men by mere preaching or by prayer. He has appointed sacraments as essentially necessary, and ministers ordained by bishops duly to administer them. Prayers by persons not of the Church can avail only for their own conversion, and the only prayers effectual in the Church for those in separation are prayers for their restoration to the Church. Dodwell says finally that if the Nonconformists continue without Christ's baptism, they must continue without Christ's salvation. If they refuse to come to the Lord's Supper, they refuse that corporal union with Christ which in the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel is declared necessary to eternal life. In this supper only can they eat Christ's flesh and drink His blood.*

Episcopal Sacraments necessary to salvation.

* The great work of this era on the subject of Conformity was called 'A Collection of Cases and other Discourses lately written to Recover Dissenters to the Communion of the Church of England. By some Divines of the City of London.' This work consists of three large volumes in the collected form The tracts bear dates from 1683 to 1685, and are of sufficient importance to have been noticed in the text, but other books have taken their place. The writers were Grove, Williams, Sherlock, Sharp, Calamy (Benjamin), Hesketh, Scott, Claget, Fowler, Hickes, Resbury, Tillotson, Hascard, Freeman, Evans, Patrick, Tenison, Cave, Francklin, Newcomin, Hooper, Stillingfleet, and Samuel Fuller. The tracts are of unequal value, and written by men of very different views, though all agreeing as to Conformity. Dr. Grove ascribes the wounds of the Church to 'the extreme scrupulosity of some,' saying also that they are 'kept still bleeding by the subtilty and cunning artifice of others.' He can find no ground as a centre of unity for Protestants but the Church of England, and it must, he says, be effected by impositions, and not by toleration. Separation, unless for unlawful impositions, is called schism. The whole argument is that the Nonconformists should conform for the sake of unity, but that the Conformists should yield nothing. Dr. Williams quotes the testimonies of many old Nonconformists against separation, which, however, prove little more than their unwillingness to separate. Benjamin Calamy, a son of the celebrated Dr. Calamy, had become a strong Conformist, and wrote on the claims of the 'Weak Brethren.' Their being 'weak' had been a plea against the impositions, but Calamy said that in the sense of St. Paul the Dissenters regarded themselves as the 'opposite of weak brethren.' The moral is that they are to obey lawful governors in things indifferent. Tenison's main argument with the Dissenters was the services of the Church of England in behalf of Protestantism. The most remarkable tract was by Hesketh, on the 'Case of Compelling Men to the Holy Sacrament.' Christ had given a command to 'compel them to come in.' In compelling men to receive the Lord's Supper the governors of Church and State are said to be actuated by kindness and not any consideration for their own interests. They are compelling Nonconformists to their greatest good, that is to have their souls strengthened and nourished by the body and blood of Christ. This tract is in the third, or supplementary volume.

Roman Catholic controversy in the time of James II.

When James II. came to the throne it was soon evident that the Church of England had to make a life and death struggle for existence. The open encouragement which the king gave to the Roman Catholic religion, and the multitude of books in its defence which were scattered over the country, were sufficient to alarm all sincere Protestants. During the reign of James the whole strength of the clergy was required for the refutation of the claims of the Church of Rome. If any Nonconformist had ever doubted the essentially Protestant character of the Church of England, all such doubts must now have been dispelled. Every party in the Church gave evidence not to be mistaken that there could be no peace with Rome till Rome is reformed. It cannot be said that in this controversy the works in defence of Protestantism were of greater value than those that had already been produced. The subject long before this had been exhausted. After Chillingworth there was nothing to be said. The writings of this period are mostly brief and intended chiefly for the general reader. The work was immediate. The attack was sudden and had to be suddenly repelled. The defenders of the Church of England, however, were well prepared. Their opponents were before them as straw and stubble.*

Gibson's 'Preservative.'

The number of books produced by this controversy form by themselves a considerable catalogue.† Half a century after their publication, the chief of those on the Protestant side were collected by Bishop Gibson and published in three folio volumes, with the title of 'A Preservative Against Popery.'‡ In the preface, Bishop Gibson says that the device of the Roman Catholics of that age was 'the bringing down Popery to less distance from Protestantism, as well as the raising Protestantism to as many degrees nearer Popery.' By this means 'unwary' and ignorant people were deceived. But the Churchmen of every class knew

* Macaulay says, 'It was indeed impossible for any intelligent and candid Roman Catholic to deny that the champions of his Church were in every talent and acquirement completely overmatched. The ablest of them would not, on the other side, have been considered as of the third rate.'—'History of England,' vol. ii. p. 110.

† There is an edition of 1689, and another corrected in 1714.

‡ It is really true that Dr. John Henry Newman has attempted to sneer at Gibson's 'Preservative.'

CHAP. VII.

their position. They regarded the difference between the Churches as vital, and they defended the separation as necessary while the Roman Church was unreformed.

Dr. Stratford on 'The Necessity of the Reformation.'

Following the order in Gibson's collection, the first treatise is by Dr. Stratford, afterwards Bishop of Chester. The subject is the necessity of Reformation. The Roman claim to infallibility is reckoned the insuperable barrier between Rome and Protestants. The corruptions of the Church before the Reformation were so many that the Reformers had no choice but at once to set about removing them. An infallible Church could never have fallen into such errors as prevailed before the Reformation. It is true that many texts are quoted for infallibility, but they are like the one cited by the 'angelical doctor' to prove the necessity of implicit faith, 'the oxen were ploughing and the asses were feeding beside them.' Particular churches, according to Dr. Stratford, may have been infallible while the Apostles lived. They had the promise of being led by the Holy Spirit into all truth. The Church over which Timothy presided had erred. It has now ceased to exist. There is no Church of Ephesus. The city has not a single Christian family. Authority, it is maintained, does not imply infallibility. A magistrate or a parent may have to judge, and yet their judgments may err. In the Church of Rome infallibility has disproved itself. That Church imposes doctrines contrary to Scripture and reason; and unknown to antiquity. Such are its claims to be infallible, to be the whole Catholic Church, to govern princes, and the monstrous doctrine of transubstantiation decreed by the fourth Lateran Council.

Continued by Dr. Claget.

This subject was continued by Dr. Claget, preacher at Gray's Inn. He justified the Reformation by our Reformers, because there was no hope of any remedy from the Church of Rome. The pretended reformation by the Council of Trent was 'vanity.' It made worse that which was already bad, and it converted many private opinions into dogmas necessary to salvation. The English Reformers aimed simply at retaining truth and rejecting error. The Church of Rome, claiming to be the whole Catholic Church, was the cause of the separation of the Church of England. It was not Cranmer's blame that he was the first Reformer. It was the

blame of his predecessors in the see of Canterbury, who did not begin a Reformation before his time. If the subject is to be discussed on the ground of the regularity of English orders, Dr. Claget is willing to do it even on that ground. But he does not regard ordination as the door into the sheep-fold. Good shepherds may come into the fold without regular orders, even as many have come in with them who were thieves and robbers. Gilbert Burnet, afterwards Bishop of Salisbury, followed Dr. Claget on the same subject. He regarded the Church of Rome as having made shipwreck of faith. Its doctrine, worship and practice are opposed to the nature, designs, and character of the Christian faith. It is the 'mystery of iniquity,' Antichrist, the Roman Babylon that was to bewitch the earth with her sorceries.

And Gilbert Burnet.

Dr. Cave vindicated the Church of England from the charge of schism. It retained the ancient creeds as the confession of its faith. It reverenced the first four General Councils, and taught no doctrines that could not be proved by the word of God and 'the general consent of the Fathers.' Next to the word of God, the Church of England reverenced antiquity. It appeals to both, and desires by both to be ruled. It retains episcopal government, but it passes no judgment on those churches which have dispensed with Episcopacy. This subject was continued by Dr. Altham, Rector of Bishopsgate. The separation was entirely charged on the Church of Rome. We never wished to separate, but we had no other alternative. Altham defines heresy as 'an error in the foundation of religion openly taught and obstinately defended.' In this sense the Church of England could not be charged with heresy, for it receives nothing as an article of faith which may not be proved by Holy Scripture. For this reason alone it accepts the three creeds. The visible Church is not regarded as a judge of controversies, nor its essence as consisting of a succession of bishops, but in holding the pure doctrines taught in the word of God.

Dr. Cave vindicates the Church of England from the charge of schism.

Dr. Hascard, Dean of Windsor, vindicated the Church of England from the charge of novelty. He compared Christianity to the pearl of great price, which the Church of Rome had covered with heaps of rubbish. These were removed by the Reformers and the pearl shone again with

Dean Hascard from the charge of novelty.

CHAP. VII.

its first splendour. The Christian faith is described as very simple in itself. It consists in believing that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. St. Paul told the Philippian jailor to believe this and he would be saved. Christianity is not identified with a visible Church or with Church offices. The true Church, according to Dr. Hascard, is not always visible. In the time of Arius no man knew where to find it. Before the Reformation it was again hidden by clouds of error.

Gilbert Burnet contributed a learned treatise on the validity and regularity of English ordinations. It had been objected against Archbishop Parker's consecration that the commission came from Parliament without authority from the Church; that the consecrators were without sees; two were elect, one a quondam, and one a suffragan. As all subsequent consecrations depend on Parker's, it was inferred that the Church of England had no true bishops, and therefore it could be no part of the Catholic Church. Its priests could not administer the Lord's Supper without committing sacrilege, and being guilty of a 'sacramental forgery.' Its members could not eat Christ's flesh and drink His blood. Its recognition of the foreign Reformed Churches as true churches, was urged as sufficient evidence that it did not consider bishops as necessary to the essence of a church. The very words of the ordination service, 'Take thou authority to preach the word of God and to administer sacraments,' ignored the idea of a proper priesthood. Here is no mention of the power of consecration, though Archbishop Bramhall says that the form of words must express power to consecrate or make present Christ's body. There is nothing said of sacrifice, the proper function of the priesthood. The compilers of the English service had no power over the body of Christ. They were made bishops merely by authority of Parliament and could not confer the office of priesthood. From the time of Edward to the Restoration there were no words in the Ordination Service implying consecrating power, while the necessity of such words was admitted both by Bramhall and Mason.

No proper priesthood in the Church of England.

Burnet answers, that we require no other words for ordination than those which were used by Christ when He ordained His Apostles. The words '*Hoc facite*' were used at

English Orders valid and regular.

the institution of the Eucharist, not at the ordination of the first preachers of the Gospel. They are not the words actually in use in the Church of Rome. The Roman form is, 'Receive thou power to offer sacrifice to God, and to celebrate Mass both for the quick and the dead.' The forms of the Primitive Church had no words giving power to consecrate. Nor have the forms of the Greek Church to this day, and yet the Church of Rome itself recognizes Greek Orders. The Latin Church was willing at the Council of Florence to receive the Greek into communion without re-ordination of its priests. In the ordination service of the Council of Carthage, the oldest in existence, there is nothing required but the episcopal blessing, and the imposition of the hands of the bishop and the presbyters. Dionysius the Areopagite says, that in his time the priest was ordained kneeling before the bishop, who consecrated him with prayer, signing him with the sign of the cross. After this the bishop and the rest of the clergy gave him the kiss of peace. Morinus quotes from several ancient rituals, where no such power is mentioned as the power to consecrate. The oldest in which it is found was about seven hundred years old. The words were, 'Receive power to offer sacrifice to God and to celebrate masses.' Yet in rituals of the eleventh century these words are not found, which proves that they were not in general use. Pope Innocent said that the words, 'Be thou a priest,' were in themselves sufficient. Burnet says that our priests receive the power of consecrating which Christ left to His Church, but not the power 'to perform the incredible miracle of transubstantiation.' The Christian priesthood is not the same in kind as that of the sons of Levi. Christ alone was a priest as they were priests. As to our bishops being appointed by authority of Parliament, Burnet answers, that it was always so with bishops in similar cases. They have their authority as bishops from Christ. But if the objectors will argue the question only on their own ground, Burnet is ready even for this. Cranmer had the pall from Rome. He may have been a heretic, but heresy does not destroy the validity of orders. Felix was consecrated Bishop of Rome by the Arians in the place of Liberius, and yet he

Christ alone a proper priest.

CHAP. VII.

was reckoned a righteous Pope, and his ordinations valid. According to Morinus, the ordinations of such heretics as Nestorians, Pelagians, Eutychians, and Monothelites were admitted to be valid by the Church of Rome. In 1662, the words "Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a priest" were added to the Ordination Service, but no one ever supposed that ordination according to the old form was not valid.

Dr. Lloyd on 'Papal Supremacy.'

The subject of the Papal Supremacy was undertaken by Dr. Lloyd, afterwards Bishop of St. Asaph. During the first three hundred years after Christ he could find only two Popes, Victor and Stephen, who had taken upon them to censure any who were not of their own diocese. And even these censures, so far as we can learn, were only declarations of non-communion, such as any bishop in the present day might make in regard to the Bishop of Rome. As Bishop of the imperial city, it was natural that he should have precedence. But that is not supremacy. If the Pope had no lawful dominion over the whole Church, it followed that he had none over the Church of England. The right accorded to him before the Reformation was not supremacy. It was always subordinate to a General Council. Dr. Patrick took up the same subject in its relations to Scripture. He denies that any supremacy was ever given to St. Peter. The power of the keys, whatever that may mean, was conferred on the other apostles, as well as on St. Peter. The claim of supremacy was built on 'three metaphorical speeches' addressed to St. Peter, and yet in none of these is there a syllable concerning the Bishop of Rome, or the successor of St. Peter. These speeches are: 'Upon this rock will I build my Church;' 'I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven;' and, 'Feed my sheep.' A matter of so vast importance should have had a better foundation, and been delivered in plainer words. To build the Papal Supremacy on such texts as these is to trifle with the Scriptures. Dr. Patrick adds, that surely the Church of Rome may cease talking about the danger of the laity wresting the Scriptures. It is impossible that they could be more wrested than these passages have been by learned priests.

Dr. Resbury, Rector of Shadwell, followed Dr. Patrick in

Dr. Resbury on 'The Visible Church.'

a discourse on the visible Church, with reference to the claim of the Pope to be its head. He interpreted the passages usually applied to the visible Church as applicable only to the invisible. The Catholic Church was the whole company of the faithful in heaven and earth. The visible Church, he said, would never fail; that is, there will always be men holding the faith of Christ. The number, however, may be so small that the Church will scarcely be visible before the world. It has been so in past times. Athanasius stood alone against the world in the time of Arius. Yet history records that there were other faithful bishops besides Athanasius. In the darkest of the middle ages Christ had always faithful witnesses to bear testimony against the general corruption. Resbury did not believe that the visible Church was always to appear before the world in its unity, its catholicity, and its external organization, nor did he believe that the Church of Rome was that visible Church. The passages generally quoted to prove the perpetual visibility of the Church say nothing of its having a visible head, nor of that head being the Bishop of Rome.

Dr. Freeman on the 'Catholic Church.'

The most important series in Gibson's collection is that on the 'Catholic Church.' The first is by Dr. Freeman, afterwards Dean of Peterborough, who defines the Catholic Church on earth as consisting of all Christians in all ages who have professed the Christian faith. Dr. Sherlock, Dean of St. Paul's, goes deeper into this question. He argues against the claims of the Papacy, from the unity of the whole Church in heaven and earth. That Church, of which the Church on earth is but a part, is Christ's body. Its unity does not consist in its having a visible organization, but in having Christ for its head. A visible head might make the Church on earth one, but it could not make the whole Church one, unless that visible head were also the head of the Church in heaven. It is indeed possible that even this the Pope professes to be, for he canonizes saints that are in heaven and he releases souls out of Purgatory. If the Pope is only head of the Church on earth, it cannot be said that that Church is the 'one body,' for the body of Christ is the whole Church in heaven and earth. And if Christ be that head of the whole Church, the headship of the Pope is not

CHAP. VII.

required to constitute unity. External acts of worship and mutual intercourse are not necessary to constitute the unity of the Church. Without these the whole Church in heaven and earth is one.

Bellarmine's fifteen notes of the Church are examined in succession by several writers. Dr. Sherlock, in some general remarks, shows that the Cardinal is wrong in the very principles on which he starts. He ought to lay down certain notes by which the Catholic Church may be known, but instead of that he only seeks to find some marks by which the Church of Rome may be distinguished from other churches. Dr. Freeman begins with the first note, which is the name Catholic. Bellarmine said that this name always belonged to those in communion with the see of Rome. Dr. Freeman answers that the ancient Fathers called that Church Catholic which held the Catholic faith, that is, the faith preached by Christ and His Apostles. It got the name Catholic because it was to be preached always and everywhere and to be believed by all. In the first ages the main body of the Church held the Catholic faith, and in those days the name really was a note of the Church. The separatist sects took their names from their leaders. Hence Cyril of Jerusalem advised his catechumens, when they went to any strange city, to ask for the Catholic Church, for there 'the true faith is taught.' And Pacianus, identifying the true faith and the Catholic Church, says, 'Christian is my name, Catholic is my surname; by the one I am distinguished from heathens, by the other from heretics and schismatics.' So long as a Church holds the Catholic faith it is Catholic. When it ceases to hold that faith the name ceases to be a note of the Church. It is but an idle argument to say that because the Church of Rome calls itself Catholic therefore it is Catholic. In ordinary speech we, in courtesy, call members of the Church of Rome Catholics because they do not like to be called Papists, which, however, is really their proper name. In conventional language, the Church of Rome is the Catholic Church. This is the meaning of Augustine's words, cited by Bellarmine, 'That should a stranger happen in any city to inquire even of a heretic where he might go to find a Catholic Church,

On the name 'Catholic.'

Roman Catholics called 'Catholics' only in conventional language.

the heretic would not dare to send him to his own house or oratory.' But that which is now called the Catholic Church has corrupted the faith. Names, at best, Dr. Freeman adds, are but arbitrary things. The Church of Sardis had a name to live, but it was dead. The Church of Laodicea boasted that it was rich when it was very poor. Simon Magus was called the great power of God. Mahomet was called a great prophet. It was foretold that many would come saying 'I am Christ.' The Bishop of Rome calls himself the Vicar of Christ, but many call him Antichrist. It is added that this name Catholic, which is made a note of the Church, is never in the New Testament applied to the Church.

Dr. Patrick on 'Antiquity.'

Dr. Patrick took up the second note, 'Antiquity,' which was not peculiar to the Church of Rome, but common to all other false religions. There was a time when the Church was new. Yet even then the argument from antiquity was used. The woman of Samaria rested her faith here, 'Our fathers worshipped on this mountain.' She really had antiquity on her side. It was in Samaria that Abraham and Jacob built altars. Here was the sanctuary in the days of Joshua. Here was Shiloh, where the ark of God rested for three hundred years, and here the patriarchs were buried. Jerusalem was then in possession of the Jebusites, yet afterwards it was chosen for the worship of Jehovah. The complaint of the Jews against Jesus was that He did not follow the tradition of the elders. They called the first Christians a 'sect,'—the 'sect of the Nazarenes.' The Pagans objected to St. Paul's doctrine that it was new, supposing, as Augustine says, 'that truth is proved by antiquity, not by eternity.' But Bellarmine has chosen the wrong word. By antiquity he means priority. The Catholic Church was before heretics, just as God was before the devil, or as the wheat in the parable was sown before the tares. The devil has great antiquity, but he has not priority, neither has the Church of Rome. Its doctrines are not to be found in the New Testament. We know their history and their origin. The Papal authority itself began with Pope Stephen. He was followed by Zosimus, Boniface, and Celestine. The last of these was sharply rebuked by the African bishops, for his intrusion into their affairs upon the pretence of a canon

CHAP. VII.

of the Nicene Council. The efforts of other Popes after supremacy and the resistance they met are matters of history. Boniface at length succeeded in wresting from Phocas the title of Universal Bishop, and to his Church the title of Head of all Churches. The Church of England is no new Church. It has nothing new except condemnation of the novelties of the Church of Rome. If that Church had not made new articles of faith, our Reformers would not have found it necessary to make articles in condemnation of those of the Church of Rome. Tertullian says that those churches alone are Apostolic which hold the doctrines of the Apostles.

The Church of England ont new.

John Williams on 'Uninterrupted Duration.'

John Williams, afterwards Bishop of Chichester, discussed Bellarmine's third note, 'Uninterrupted Duration.' Bellarmine assumes that his Church existed in the beginning. The same is assumed by all the rival churches. At the Council of Trent the Bishop of Bitonto confessed the Greek Church to be the mother of the Latin. But duration cannot be proved until it is certain that the Roman Church will continue to the end. And if duration is to be received for a standing note of a church, then the Churches of Asia, which have ceased to exist, could never have been true churches. Williams doubts if the duration of the Church of Rome until now has been uninterrupted. The city was frequently sacked and destroyed. At one time it was deserted by the Popes for seventy years. If, as Bellarmine says, heresy makes void the succession of orders, then the Church of Rome has not had uninterrupted duration. Pope Zephyrinus was a Montanist, Marcellinus sacrificed to idols, Liberius and Felix were contaminated with the Arian heresy, Anastasius was a Nestorian, Honorius a Monothelite, and John XXIII. denied the life to come. The doctrines of the present Church of Rome are not those of the ancient Church of Rome. It cannot be said that there has been uninterrupted duration where there has been change.

Popes that have been heretics.

Dr. Fowler on 'Amplitude or Multitude and Variety of Believers.'

The fourth note is 'Amplitude or Multitude and Variety of Believers,' which was taken up by Dr. Fowler, afterwards Bishop of Gloucester. This was the argument of Demetrius for Diana, 'whom all Asia and the world worshippeth.' There have always been more Pagans than Christians. Even

now there are more Mahometans than Roman Catholics. All men know the words of St. Jerome, 'the world groaned and wondered that it had become Arian.' Athanasius against the world is almost a proverb. The Church described in the Apocalypse was to have power over all kindreds, nations, and tongues, but it was not therefore the true Church. In the time of Christ the Church was a little flock, that went in by a strait gate and a narrow way. It is true that the redeemed are to be a great multitude, a number which no man can number. But as yet the Church has ever been small compared with the multitudes of mankind. If numbers were to be taken as the note of the true church, Roman Catholics, Dr. Fowler says, would not gain much. Their number, it is added, scarcely exceeds that of Protestants.

Dr. Thorp on the 'Succession of Bishops.'

Dr. Thorp, Prebendary of Canterbury, examined the fifth note, 'Succession of Bishops.' He admits the necessity of true and lawful pastors, and that the chief power of ordination is with the bishops—the successors of the apostles. All this, he says, is agreeable to the doctrine of the Church of England. But though this be necessary to the right ordering of a church, he doubts if it be necessary to its essential existence. The admission to the true Church is by baptism, and that is valid by whomsoever administered. If heresy and schism can destroy the succession it must have been destroyed long since in the Church of Rome. The divine right of bishops was opposed in the Council of Trent by those who held the divine right of the Pope. Bellarmine admits that there may be the true succession without true Churches, as in the Churches of the East. So that succession of bishops is no evidence of true doctrine, for then every church founded by the Apostles would have been infallible. The Fathers always prefer true doctrine to a succession of persons, for without the former the latter avails nothing.

Payne on 'Agreement in Doctrine with the Primitive Church.'

Bellarmine's sixth note, 'Agreement in Doctrine with the Primitive Church' was considered by Dr. Payne, Prebendary of Westminster. This was admitted to be a satisfactory test of a true church. The Church of England appealed to Scripture alone, but it was always willing to

CHAP. VII.

follow the canon of Lirinensis, 'to have the line of Scripture interpretation directed by the rule of Catholicity and ecclesiastical judgment.' Scripture is our rule, but we are not afraid to meet the Church of Rome on the ground of antiquity. The Reformers before Cranmer and Ridley were not well read in the Fathers. They made their appeal to Scripture alone. Payne says that this was right, and far better than opening the wide question concerning the doctrine and authority of the primitive Church. But when the champions of the Church of Rome appealed to the Fathers, the Reformers of the Church of England said that to the Fathers they should go. Bishop Jewel had shown that all the peculiar doctrines of the Church of Rome were unknown to the Fathers. The Roman Church does not really profess to rest on antiquity, but on its present authority and its supposed infallibility.

Dr. Claget on the 'Union of the Members among themselves and with their Head.'

The seventh note is the 'Union of the Members among themselves and with their Head.' In treating of this note Dr. Claget regarded the Church as limited to those who were really true Christians. They are one, and Christ is their Head. Bellarmine described the unity of Catholics to consist in this, that 'they all agree to submit their own sense to the sense of one and the same pastor.' Dr. Claget answers that the members of every Church are so far united as to agree among themselves in their common faith. The unity of the Church of Rome is nothing more than this. It has its sects and parties like all other churches. Its General Councils do not agree. Its Popes do not agree. It is even a question where the seat of infallibility is to be found. In the Church of England we have all the unity that is necessary. We hold the true faith. We take the Scripture alone for our guide, and we have Christ for the Head of the Church.

Dr. Scott on 'Sanctity of Doctrine.'

Bellarmine's eighth note was 'Sanctity of Doctrine.' This subject fell to Dr. John Scott, Rector of St. Giles-in-the-Fields. Sanctity of doctrine really meant true faith. As a Church might be a true Church and yet hold many errors, and, on the other hand, as a schismatical Church might hold the true faith without error, Dr. Scott did not see how the true faith could be a note in Bellarmine's sense. By a note

Bellarmine meant a mark by which the inquirer might be guided in his search for the true Church. But here we must first know the true doctrine before we find the true Church. This is perfectly right on the Protestant ground, but the Roman Catholic theory supposes a man to have found the true Church before he finds true doctrine. Dr. Scott says that for an ordinary inquirer, with the New Testament in his hand, it is not difficult to find the truth. All that he needs is 'probity of mind' and 'sound intellectuals.'

Dr. Linford on 'Efficacy of Doctrine.'

Dr. Linford, Prebendary of Westminster, discussed Bellarmine's ninth note, the 'Efficacy of Doctrine.' This means the success of the Church of Rome in the conversion of nations. It is answered that physical force has often been more efficacious with the Church of Rome than its doctrines. For this we are referred to the persecution of the Huguenots and the history of the time of Charlemagne. Mezeray, in his life of Charlemagne says, that conquerors used to take pledges from the conquered nations that they would abide in the Christian faith. It is true that the gospel in the past ages had great success, as Christ had foretold. But he never spoke of its success as an evidence of its truth. In all ages errors have been widely diffused. Christianity itself, after existing for three hundred years, was suddenly overcome by Arianism. It was embraced by the whole nation of the Goths under Bishop Ulphilas. Three hundred years later arose Mahometanism, which, according to Linford's reckoning, numbered six thirteenths of the whole world, while all Christians together did not make more than five thirteenths. Bellarmine's historic proofs of the efficacy of Roman doctrine were the conversion of whole nations, as the English, the Germans, the Vandals, and the Jews. Linford answers 'that Augustine converted the English by deforming the old British Churches, that Boniface could not keep the Germans from idolatry without the help of the king of the Franks, that the Vandals were converted by the arms of the King of Denmark,' and as for the Jews, Heraclius, the Emperor, charged Dagobert, the King of France, that 'all Jews who did not become Christians, were to be banished or put to death.'

CHAP. VII.

Thomas Tenison on 'Holiness of Life.'

'Holiness of Life,' Bellarmine's tenth note, was considered by Thomas Tenison, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury. The word 'holy' has two senses. One is that of calling, dedication, or separation for a sacred object. In this sense the Church is holy. It was so called in the creed, before the insertion of the word Catholic. In this sense St. Paul called the Church of Corinth holy, in this sense all baptized persons are holy. The other holiness is inward or actual. Tenison cannot see how, in either sense, holiness is to be a mark by which the true Church is to be known. If actual holiness is to be a note of the true Church, then the Church of the Jews established by God Himself must have been without it at one time. And if it were a mark, the Church of Rome could gain but little by it. The Latin Church of the tenth century, as we read of it in Baronius, Bellarmine, and Genebrard, was not holy. The Popes of that age were 'monsters' rather 'apostatical than apostolical.' William of Malmesbury says that at the time of the Norman Conquest 'the priests could scarcely stammer out mass, and all sorts of people were given to shameful intemperance.' The note of actual holiness would never lead us to Bellarmine's Church.

Resbury on the 'Glory of Miracles.'

The eleventh note is the 'Glory of Miracles.' According to Bellarmine, the Catholic Church in all ages has been able to work miracles, in order to establish its claims against heretics. This subject was taken up by Dr. Resbury, who said that miracles, independent of their character, were not sufficient to establish the truth of any religion. He contrasted the miracles of the Gospel with those mentioned by Bellarmine. The Cardinal might, if he liked, believe the ecclesiastical miracles, but Resbury had no disposition that way, much less to receive them for a note of the true Church.

Other notes of the Church.

The last four notes are, the 'Light of Prophecy,' the 'Confession of Adversaries,' the 'Unhappy end of the Church's Enemies,' and 'Temporal Felicity.' These are discussed respectively by Dr. Claget, Dr. Kidder, afterwards Bishop of Bath and Wells, Dr. Stratford, and Dr. Grove. Bellarmine claimed for the Church of Rome the gift of prophecy as well as the glory of miracles. To refute its pretensions

vas easier than to establish them. The confession of dversaries was that of Pagans, Jews, and Turks, in which)r. Kidder did not find anything in favour of the Church of Rome to the prejudice of the Reformed Churches. Concerning the unhappy end of the Church's adversaries, Dr. Stratford quoted the words of Solomon, 'that all things vere alike to all men, and that there is no difference etween him that sacrificeth and him that sacrificeth not.' Bellarmine's cases of the unhappy end of adversaries were, uther dying suddenly, after spending a merry evening vith his friends; Œcolampadius being found dead in his ed; and Calvin being eaten up of worms. Temporal licity was judged but a poor note of the true Church, in ie light of what we read in Scripture of the calamities of ie righteous and the prosperity of the wicked.

Tenison and Sherlock on 'The Rule of Faith.'

Two other tracts in the collection require to be noticed. ne is on 'A Guide in Matters of Faith,' by Dr. Tenison, id the other on the 'Protestant Resolution of Faith' by Dr. herlock. These two tracts may be regarded as fairly setng forth the views of the representative theologians of the hurch of England at this time. Tenison says that we are) use every available means to discover the truth, but hen all is done, men must and will be judges for themelves. These words are quoted from Thorndike. Tenison notes them not because they were remarkable, but because ney were Thorndike's, who of all the divines of that age aned most on authority. Since the days of the Apostles ie Church has had no infallible guide. There have been ve pretenders to this office:—the primitive Church, the ishops of the primitive Church, General Councils, the resent Church declaring the true sense of the Church in rmer ages, and the Roman Catholic Church. These enison reviews in order, rejecting the claims of them all. r. Sherlock shows that the Church of England never rerts to the primitive Church as an authority. It seeks the lp of the early ages to find out the meaning of Scripture, it it does not receive the Church of any age, excepting at of the Apostles, as an infallible interpreter. When we eak of the authority of the Church, we only mean that ie governors have done their best to determine what is

CHAP. VII.

true doctrine. It does not imply infallibility. The Church of England finally resolves its faith into the Scriptures which are our sole infallible authority.

Dryden's 'Hind and Panther.'

On the Roman Catholic side, we should not omit Dryden's 'Hind and Panther.' The Poet Laureate had become a convert to the faith of the King. Whether sincerely or not is a subject on which Sir Walter Scott takes the one side, and Lord Macaulay the other. Dryden had written a controversial tract against Stillingfleet, which the great controversialist merely noticed in company with some others of equally little value. The poet retired to the country and assailed the Church of England with his own weapons. The 'milk-white hind, immortal and unchanged,' was the Roman Catholic Church. The spotted panther was the Church of England. The Presbyterians, Independents, Free-thinkers, Quakers, Anabaptists, and Unitarians, were respectively the 'insatiate wolf,' the 'bloody bear,' the 'buffoon ape,' the 'quaking hare,' the 'bristled boar,' and 'false reynard.' The panther is

'Sure the noblest creature next the hind,
And fairest creature of the spotted kind.'

It is, however, a beast of prey. The Church of England is charged with indecision in its teaching. Its doctrine of the real presence in the Eucharist, is called a contradiction:

'Not only Jesuits can equivocate;
For real, as you now the word expound,
From solid substance dwindles to a sound.
Methinks an Æsop's fable you repeat,
You know who took the shadow for the meat.'

It denies the authority of Fathers and Councils and yet it appeals to them:

'And, after all her winding ways are tried,
If doubts arise, she slips herself aside,
And leaves the private conscience for a guide.'

The panther may hate the other beasts, but it does the work of the wolf when the hind is near. The lion, that is James II., suffered all the beasts to drink at a stream, and among them the hind.

'Drank a sober draught.'

Then

'The surly wolf, with secret envy burst,
Yet could not howl; (the hind had seen him first;)
But what he durst not speak the panther durst.'

CHAP. VII.

The accession of a Roman Catholic monarch to the throne of England seemed to overthrow the main foundation on which the Protestant Church was established. The Reformers had looked to the sovereign as the representative of the national life. The Reformation took the form of a protest, not merely against Roman doctrine but against foreign supremacy. The Duke of York, becoming a Roman Catholic, gave rise to a perplexing question about the duty of allegiance if in the probable course of events he should succeed to the throne. A Bill of Exclusion passed the Commons, but was rejected by the Lords. The clergy had finally to make a choice between the Protestant religion and the divine right of the King.

A Roman Catholic monarch not compatible with the existence of the Church of England.

During the early part of the seventeenth century, and indeed on till the Revolution of 1688, passive obedience was supposed to be the unquestioned doctrine of the Church of England. The royalists regarded themselves as the only true Churchmen, and those who opposed the arbitrary government of the first Charles were also accounted enemies of the Church of England. It is true that the Church of England had always looked to the King as its protector, and had always inculcated the duty of obedience to lawful government. It was also true that a party of Churchmen had gone with King Charles in maintaining that his will must be law.* A Christian subject, it was said, could have no rights against his sovereign. Christianity inculcated obedience, and the first Christians never resisted the government of the most abandoned of the Roman Emperors. The doctrine of the Church of England on this subject was never definite. When it came to be discussed, it was found difficult to prove that anything was ever meant beyond a due respect for those who are entrusted with the secular power.

Passive obedience.

In the multitude of addresses presented to King Charles in favour of the succession of the Duke of York, great importance was placed on the argument drawn from the

* This doctrine always had some limits, even with the most obsequious Churchmen. The King once asked Bishops Neyle and Andrewes if he could not always tax his subjects when he wanted money. Neyle laid down the principle that a king could take a subject's money. Andrewes, who was sometimes facetious, said the King might take brother Neyle's money, for he offered it.

CHAP. VII.

Samuel Johnson's 'Julian the Apostate.'

obedience of the first Christians. This argument was examined by Samuel Johnson in a work which was called 'Julian the Apostate.' Johnson had been Chaplain to the Lord Russell who was executed for the part he had taken in the Exclusion Bill. He denied that passive obedience was the doctrine of Christianity, of the Fathers, of the Reformers or of the Church of England. St. Paul always stood on his privileges as a Roman citizen. He even told slaves if they could get their freedom, to use it rather. The Fathers did not give allegiance to Julian, and the Reformers of the Church of England would gladly have excluded Queen Mary from the succession, according to the will of Edward VI The bishops, in the reign of Elizabeth, agreed to the statute which makes it high treason to say that an Act of Parliament does not bind the crown. The same bishops urged the execution of the Queen of Scots as one that had tried 'to seduce the people of God in this realm from true religion.' A Bill of Exclusion against the Duke of York would be in perfect harmony with the spirit and the deeds of the Reformers. To those who pleaded the oaths of allegiance, the answer was, that they are Protestant oaths. The meaning of their imposition was the exclusion of the Roman power and the Roman Catholic religion.

Was the Roman Empire hereditary?

Johnson's first point in regard to Julian is to prove that the Roman empire was hereditary. Eusebius, speaking of Constantine, says, 'Thus the throne of the empire descended to him from his father, and by the law of nature was reserved for his sons, and for their posterity, and was to descend for ever as another paternal inheritance does.' Eumenius, in an address to Constantine, says, 'It was not the casual consent of men, it was not any sudden effect of their favour, which made you a prince. You gained the empire by being born into the world.' Julian was the grandson of Constantine, and his rightful heir as Constantine was of his father Constantius Chlorus. If, Johnson says, a divine right should be wanted, whatever that may mean, we have it in the words of Eusebius, that the empire was entailed 'by the edict of nature,' in another place called 'the law of nature.' There are also the words of Julian himself, that God had vouchsafed to crown him 'with His own unspotted right hand.'

t was this title which the Christians set aside, not indeed y a Bill of Exclusion, for Julian had come to the throne nder the profession of a Christian. They could not remonstrate with Constantius while alive, for they were ignorant f Julian's apostasy. But what they had no occasion to do hile Constantius lived, they did after his death. Gregory, n his invective, immediately after Julian's death, addressing he soul of Constantius, reproached him with having saved and ade Julian a king, 'who was both ill-saved, and made an l king.' One of the things which Constantius lamented on is death-bed as unworthy of his reign, was the assistance e had given to Julian, not knowing that he was an apostate.

In the lifetime of Julian, the Christians treated him ith great indignity, prayed for his confusion, beat his riests before his eyes, and would have beaten him too if he ad not kept out of their way. He called them Galileans; nd they in like derision named him Idolianus, instead of ulianus; because of his many sacrifices, the bull-burner; ecause he worshipped Jupiter and Adonis, Pisæus and donæus. The people of Antioch excelled in this, and even hafed him into the revengeful humour of writing a book gainst them. They ridiculed him for the shape of his body, is manner of walking, and his goat's beard. For this they ere commended by Theodoret, who says they 'did always bominate Julian, who ought never to be remembered.' he same Theodoret records of Maris, the blind Bishop of halcedon, that he was led by the hand to the temple of ortune, where Julian was sacrificing, and reproached the mperor, calling him 'impious apostate, and an atheist.' he Emperor, in return, reproached him with his blindness, aying, 'Your Galilean God will not cure you.' To which he bishop answered, 'I thank God for striking me with lindness, that I may not see thy face, who art thus fallen nto impiety.' We read again that Valentinian, when he as colonel of the Household Guards, went with Julian n procession to the Temple of Fortune. The chaplains ere sprinkling those who entered with holy water. When Valentinian saw the holy water coming near his clothes, 'he struck the chaplain with his fist, saying, that it would not

Julian treated with contempt by the Christians.

CHAP. VII.

cleanse him, but defile him.' This made Augustine say of Valentinian, that he 'was a confessor of the Christian faith under Julian, and lost his place in the Guards for it.' Gregory Nazianzen, in the funeral sermon on his father's death, mentions his father's determined opposition to Julian. The Emperor had come to Nazianzum with his archers, and imperiously demanded the temple. Gregory says that his father the bishop so boiled with anger, that if he had got his hands on Julian, he would not have gone away without being 'kicked.' The passage is admitted to be difficult, because it seems to make an emperor afraid of a kicking from an old bishop. But Johnson says it is impossible to understand it in any other sense.

The Bishop of Nazianzum threatens to 'kick' Julian.

The Christians showed the same contempt for Julian even in their devotions. He commanded them to remove the bones of Babylas and his fellow-martyrs from Daphne, where Apollo's temple stood. They did so, gladly dancing before the coffin, singing David's psalms, and adding at the end of every verse, 'Confounded be all they that worship graven images!' Julian seized Theodorus, one of the leaders, put him in prison, and treated him with great cruelty. Yet Theodorus would do nothing but chant the refrain, 'Confounded be all they that worship graven images!' To the same effect is Theodoret's account of the widow Publia, who had a choir of virgins devoted to virginity. When the Emperor passed they sang their psalms more lustily, that he might hear,—'The idols of the heathen are silver and gold, the work of men's hands.' Julian was vexed, and commanded them to be silent when he passed, but they only sang the louder,—'Let God arise, and let His enemies be scattered.' To all this Gregory Nazianzen testifies when he says, in an oration, 'As for his destruction, how can any one appear to have done more towards it than my father, either in public striking the villain with the joint prayers and supplications of all the people together, and not at all fearing the times, or in private drawing forth his nightly squadrons against him? I mean his lying upon the ground, where he tore out his old flesh, and watered the floor with his tears for almost a whole year together.'

The Christians sing psalms against him.

The death of Julian was to the Christians the occasion of

…phant joy. It was made known to some of them by …ation before the news had time to reach the West. Libanius asked a Christian schoolmaster what the carpenter's Son was doing? The Christian, 'being filled with divine grace,' answered, 'The Creator of the world, whom you call the carpenter's Son, is making a coffin.' In a few days, Theodoret says, it was known at Antioch that the 'wretch' was dead. To St. Julian Sabba it was revealed that 'the wild boar, the enemy of the Lord's vineyard, had suffered the punishment of his sins and lay dead.' When the Christians heard this they 'fell a-dancing, and offered up to God a hymn of thanksgiving.' Theodoret says, 'His old friends, the Antiochians, as soon as they heard of his death, kept feasts and public joyful meetings, and they not only had dances in their churches and chapels of the martyrs, but likewise in their theatre.' They proclaimed the victory of the Cross, crying aloud with one voice, 'God and His Christ have gotten the victory.' It was unknown by whose hand the spear was thrown which caused Julian's death. Socrates supposes he was killed by one of his own soldiers. Callistus says that the spear was thrown by a demon. Theodoret says 'whether it was man or angel,' he was the 'minister of the divine appointment and direction.' Libanius insinuates that the death of Julian was the work of a Christian; which, Sozomen says, may be true, adding, 'You can hardly blame him who shows himself so courageous for God and for that religion which he approves.' Over a monument which the Christians erected to the memory of Julian, they inscribed 'Thou persecutor next to Herod, thou traitor next to Judas, who hast testified thy repentance by hanging thyself as he did, killer of Christ after Pilate, and next to the Jews thou hater of God.'

And dance in their churches when they hear of his death.

Johnson finds a difference between the case of the Christians under the first emperors and those under Julian. The …t Christians suffered according to the laws, but those …er Julian were persecuted contrary to the law. Our …ition is like that under Julian. We have our religion …led by such laws as cannot be altered without our con… It is not of the essence of the Gospel to be a suffer… religion. The prescriptions of prayers and tears, with

The first Christians suffered according to the laws, under Julian against the laws.

CHAP. VII.

the passive obedience of the Theban legion, are not the remedies for the present time, when the laws of our country are in our favour. Most men are satisfied that Archbishop Abbot's doctrine was more the doctrine of the Church of England than that of Sibthorp; and that Mainwaring was more orthodox when he recanted, than when he preached his 'pulpit law,' as Lord Falkland called his mischievous flattery. The royal prerogative is no 'boundless bottomless pit of arbitrary power and self-will.' There is no authority upon earth above the law, much less against it. The law makes the king, and so long as he is under the law he is God's vicar, but not when he is against the law. To the fiction that the king is responsible to God only, Johnson answers that in that case the Rump Parliament did right in sending Charles I. to the proper tribunal. Julian ends with 'A Comparison between Popery and Paganism.' The essential identity of the two forms of religion was assumed all through the book, and made a part of the argument.

The king subject to the law.

'Julian the Apostate' was immediately answered by 'Constantius the Apostate.' This tract was anonymous. It professed to give an account of the life of Constantius, and 'the sense of the Primitive Christians about his successor and their behaviour towards him.' It was also to 'show the unlawfulness of excluding the next heir upon account of religion, and the necessity of passive obedience as well to the unlawful oppressor as the legal persecutor.' It had this motto from the Homily on Willful Rebellion, 'Let us either deserve to have a good prince or patiently suffer and obey such as we deserve.' It was dedicated to Samuel Johnson, who was told that, like Julian, he had taken holy orders, and, like him, he had 'denied a passive crucified Saviour.' The apostasy of Constantius was his going over to the Arians; and the argument is, that as the Christians did not refuse allegiance to the Arian apostate Constantius, they would not have promoted a Bill of Exclusion against the heathen apostate Julian. Constantius persecuted the orthodox against law, that is, if the will of a king be not in itself the highest law. He came to the throne under the profession of the same religion as his father. He joined the Arians,

'Constantius the Apostate,' an answer to 'Julian.'

nd caused many of the orthodox to be put to death on harges that had no foundation, and yet they never had so much as an evil thought of their emperor. Athanasius, Hoius, and other bishops were always subject to him. Cursng an Emperor, the author says, is no such Catholic docrine as Samuel Johnson supposes it to be. Constantius ıad been a great persecutor, yet when he died he was caried forth by the Christians with all the solemnity with vhich 'they are accustomed to honour the corpse of a pious ıero.' Arianism, and not Christianity, was the religion of he empire under Constantius. The orthodox, therefore, ere in the same position as the first Christians when the mpire was pagan. But in neither case was there any reistance shown to the powers 'ordained of God.' Another nswer to Samuel Johnson was announced at the end of Constantius,' as almost ready. This answer had the name f Julian's successor, Jovian.

'Jovian' was published anonymously, but it was known) be the work of Dr. George Hickes, afterwards Dean of Worcester, and celebrated as a Nonjuror. The life of Jovian as chosen chiefly because the facts of that life were suposed to be a direct refutation of many of the statements ade in 'Julian the Apostate.' Jovian was appointed ulian's successor, though in no way related to him; while rocopius, the nearest kinsman, was passed by, which shows ıat the Roman empire was not hereditary. Jovian was a onfessor of the Christian religion in the reign of Julian. 'rom this Dr. Hickes argues that either Julian did not ersecute illegally, or that the Christians quietly submitted) the Emperor, even when persecuted contrary to the law. ovian was lampooned by the people of Antioch in the same ay as Julian had been which proves that the cause of the atire against Julian was not his religion. When Jovian was elected Emperor by the soldiers, they all cried out that hey were Christians. This is mentioned to prove that Juan's soldiers were perfect examples of passive obedience nd non-resistance. They must have had sufficient force to esist the Emperor if they had thought resistance a duty.)r. Hickes says that the Romans had no idea of entail. Hereditary succession was grounded entirely on feudal laws,

'Jovian,' another answer to 'Julian.'

CHAP. VII.

and was received from the barbarous nations which invaded the empire.

The Roman Empire not hereditary.

If the Roman empire was not hereditary, it follows that the case of Julian is no parallel to that of James II. Besides the arguments from facts, Dr. Hickes notices the terms in which Gregory Nazianzen speaks of Julian's succession to the empire. He was 'made' Cæsar. The same word* is used in the Septuagint for the creating of Saul and Ishbosheth kings, because they were kings purely by election. Julian indeed had the vanity to boast that he had been ordained Emperor by God Himself, and that he had signs from heaven admonishing him not to resist the wishes of the army. Eusebius testifies that Constantine was declared Emperor by a voice from heaven. But surely, Dr. Hickes says, there must be a difference between the miraculous signs which were wrought for Constantine and those which Julian affirmed were given to him. Constantius, on his death-bed, lamented that he had made Julian Cæsar, because he was free not to have done it if that had been his will. Had Julian been passed by, that would not have been exclusion, seeing he had no hereditary right. It would only have been preterition or non-election. Roman emperors, as well as Roman citizens, were always at liberty to disinherit their nearest relations. When Eusebius says the throne of the empire descended to Constantine from his father, he is careful to add that it was by his father's order, which is inconsistent with the idea of entail.

Dr. Hickes finds the behaviour of the Christians towards Julian altogether different from the account given by Samuel Johnson. The soldiers were obedient when they might have rebelled. The commanders were willing to be put to death, if it were the Emperor's wish. It was difficult to explain the passage about the Bishop of Nazianzum 'kicking' the Emperor, but it was much more difficult to believe that 'so good and apostolic a bishop would so deliberately resolve to kick any man, much less his own sovereign.' It was impossible that he could have forgotten St. Paul's words, that a bishop must be no striker. Moreover, Gregory's father, according to his own account, was at that time a feeble old man,

The Bishop of Nazianzum did not wish to kick the Emperor.

* βασιλεύω.

carce able to breathe;' how then could he think of kick- g an Emperor at the head of a troop of archers? The story Publia is not denied, but it is shown that she was satisfied when Julian gave her a beating. This was what she ally wanted. She longed to be a sufferer. She desired rsecution. Her delight was in passive obedience. The hristians, as Gregory Nazianzen testifies of Julian's solers, strove to be martyrs, and he adds, that the gentless of Julian was the greatest cruelty which the Christians d to endure. Julian himself used to say, that 'the Chrisns flew to martyrdom as bees to their hive'. Resistance s far from their creed, and further from their practice. ugustine says, 'Julian was an infidel Emperor; nay, was not an apostate, unjust and an idolater? And yet the ristian soldiers served under an infidel Emperor.' And Dr. Hickes says, that if God were to suffer a Popish Julian reign over us, 'I would die rather than resist him; and this make a man a *parasite*, a *sycophant*, and *murderer*, e Christian subjects of Julian were such, and I must be too till my life's end.'

Dr. Hickes concludes with a long defence of passive obeence. He had preached a sermon on the subject, which s noticed in 'Julian the Apostate.' He states his docne plainly, that the King is accountable to none but God. e has the sole power and disposal of the sword. The spel requires from all subjects passive obedience, or nonsistance. It matters not whether the sovereign be good evil, just or unjust, Christian or Pagan. If a sovereign she's tyrannically to take away a subject's life, the subject bound by the common laws of sovereignty not to resist, nor fend himself. The kings of England are kings previous their coronation, and descent of the crown purges from all mes. But, though willing to admit a Roman Catholic sovegn to the succession, Dr. Hickes is yet resolved that he l never himself become a Roman Catholic. He differs m the author of 'Julian' in his view of the Church of me, regarding it as a true Church, though corrupt; while hnson said that its being corrupt took away from it the aracter of a true Church. This distinction is less than words it appears to be. Many English theologians

No tyrants to be resisted if they are kings.

CHAP. VII.

contended for the Church of Rome being a true Church adding the explanation that it was so in the sense that a thief is a true man. Dr. Hickes agreed entirely with Johnson in his comparison of Popery and Paganism. He was not ashamed of the name of Protestant, and he pronounced Protestantism nothing else but primitive Christianity.

Sherlock's 'Case of Resistance.'

Hickes was supported by William Sherlock, at that time Rector of St. George's, Botolph Lane. His first tract was called 'The Case of Resistance of the Supreme Powers Stated and Resolved according to the Holy Scripture.' The prevalence of what Sherlock calls 'Popish and fanatic conspiracies,' sufficiently declared that the time had come for a full discussion of this subject. Roman Catholics did not admit the divine right of the King as opposed to the Pope, nor did those whom Sherlock calls fanatics admit that right as opposed to their liberties. These conspiracies looked very different, yet they 'were tied together by the tail with a firebrand.' The duty of passive obedience might be proved out of Scripture by the doctrine and practice of the primitive Christians, or by the fundamental constitution of the government under which we live. The argument from Scripture is the only one which Sherlock uses in this tract. God Himself, it is said, set up a supreme government among the Jews, which they were not to resist. The men who opposed Moses and Aaron are described by St. Jude as those 'who despise dominions.' God took care to provide for a succession of rulers over the Jewish people. It had been objected to this, that God gave the Jews a King in His anger. The answer is, that their request of a King implied the rejection of Jehovah as their ruler. The King is the 'Lord's anointed.' He is not to be resisted. This is proved by many passages out of the New Testament as well as by histories from the Old. Zimri, who slew his master, had not peace, and no man can have peace who resists his sovereign.

Johnson replied to the authors of 'Constantius' and 'Jovian,' in a further discourse, called 'Julian's Arts to Undermine and Extirpate Christianity.' In this book he brings additional evidence from facts concerning Julian's

CHAP. VII.

'Julian's Arts to Undermine and Extirpate Christianity.'

reatment of the Christians, and their behaviour towards him, comparing the devices of the 'Papists' to those of Julian. His character for moderation and justice is not admitted. He wished to have credit for these qualities, but this was merely one of his arts of dissimulation. Sozomen and Nazianzen both record that when great barbarities were committed by the Pagans on the Christians in Gaza, Julian spoke of it as a matter not of any importance that a few Galileans should be put to death. He tried many ways of converting the people to Paganism. The soldiers, and those who had learned the duty of passive obedience, he easily persuaded, for, as Gregory said, 'they knew no other law but the will of their prince.' Those whom he could not convince by sophistry, he tempted by promises of earthly possessions. And that those who resisted all temptations might be hunted down, he made choice of magistrates, who, in Gregory's words, were 'most inhuman.' His edicts are in themselves evidence sufficient that his chief object was to destroy Christianity. All Christians were forbidden to be schoolmasters or physicians. They were not allowed to be soldiers, under pretence that their religion did not permit them to use the sword. He took their church plate, because it was too rich for the service of the Son of Mary, and he sent soldiers to relieve them of their money, that 'they might go the lighter to heaven.' When the Christians complained of their injuries, he answered, 'It is your part, when you are ill-used, to bear it, for this is the commandment of your God.'

Constantius not an apostate.

It was not admitted that Constantius was an apostate. He was a Christian emperor. The author had ascribed to him all the cruelties of the Arians during his long reign. He had given an incorrect account of the orthodox Fathers under Constantius. Their language was not that of passive obedience. St. Hilary called Constantius Antichrist, in the very title of a book written against him.* He addressed him in these words, 'Thou ravening wolf, we see thy sheep's clothing.' Lucifer Calaritanus also wrote a book against Constantius, in which are these words, with many more to

* 'Contra Constantium Augustum.' Its original title was 'Contra Constantium Antichristum.'

CHAP. VII.

the same effect—'Pray shew but one of the worshippers o God that ever spared the adversaries of his religion.' Thi book was commended by Athanasius, who said that th author had brought 'the truth to light, and set it upon candlestick, that it might give light to all.'

Besides arguments for passive obedience from the Father and the Scriptures, Johnson answered those from the Homilies and the writings of eminent divines of the Church o England. The obedience inculcated by the Homilies is not he says, submission to lawless violence, but only to lawfu authority. The main object of the Homilies on subjectio to civil rulers was to condemn rebellion in the interest o the Roman Popes and the introduction of the Roma Catholic religion. It is surely then, Johnson argues, a per version of the teaching of the Homilies to use this doctrin of obedience to the civil ruler as a means of introducing that religion. These Homilies were written by Bisho Jewel, and yet Bishop Jewel says in his Apology, speaking of the foreign Reformers,'—'Neither doth any o these teach the people to rebel against their prince, but only to defend themselves by all lawful means against oppression as did David against Saul, so do the nobles of France a this day.' Bishop Bilson, too, in a book expressly writte on the subject, and dedicated to Queen Elizabeth, defend the conduct of the French Protestants and the doctrine o Luther. He says, indeed, that 'the subject has no refuge against his sovereign, but only to God by prayer and patience.' But this is spoken of those who have not the laws on their side. Moreover, the compilers of the Homilies, the representative clergy of the Church of England i Elizabeth's reign, not only maintained in several Convocations the justice of the warfare of the French, Scotch, and Dutch Protestants for their lives and liberties, but laid dow their purses to help them. Queen Elizabeth assisted th nobility of Scotland in their Reformation, and the Earl o Warwick was sent with an army to assist the Huguenots, who were then called by the bishops and clergy in Convocation 'the professors of God's holy gospel and true religion,' for so they 'had it in their hearts to call a parcel of Calvinists who never had a bishop among them, whom

The Homilies do not teach passive obedience.

The compilers assisted other nations against evil rulers.

ome in this degenerate age would sooner unchurch and destroy than aid and assist.' These were the men who compiled the Homilies. If, then, passive obedience be the doctrine of the Homilies, it is widely different from the practice of the compilers.

In answer to 'Jovian,' Johnson says that Constantius' family was extinct in Julian. The election, therefore, of Jovian by the army, does not prove that the empire was not hereditary. Procopius pretended kindred with the house of Flavius, but it was only pretension. Jovian's 'quiet behaviour,' under Julian, does not prove that other Christians were quiet. It does not prove that Valentinian did not strike the priest when he offered to sprinkle the holy water upon him at the gate of the temple of Fortune. The conduct of the people of Antioch towards Julian was, according to Theodoret, the conduct of the Christians at Antioch. They are commended for it, and described as those who received the Gospel from Peter and Paul. The army under Julian was not Christian. When Jovian was elected Emperor, he expressly refused the office, because he was a Christian, and the army heathen. On this the soldiers with one voice called out that they were Christians. They had been Christians under Constantius, Pagans under Julian, and they were now willing to be Christians again under Jovian. There are always such 'wretches' in the world. Themistius says, 'They do not worship God, but the people,' and one of our own historians, speaking of the same kind of men in the beginning of Queen Mary's reign, says, 'They were so forward to worship the rising sun, that, to make sure work of it, they even adore the dawning day.' They do not wish a change of religion; but when it is made, the prince's religion is the current coin of the realm. The fathers certify that in Julian's time the empire was Pagan, and the Christians had to hide themselves in their houses, and flee for safety into the wilderness.

The Christians resisted Julian.

Bishop Burnet records that he once in conversation told King James that it was impossible for him to reign quietly over this nation so long as he was of the Roman Catholic religion. The king answered sharply, 'Does not the Church of England maintain the doctrine of non-resistance

Non-resistance practically refuted.

CHAP. VII.

and passive obedience?' Burnet begged him not to depend on that, as 'there was a distinction in that matter that would be found out when men thought they needed it.' The first check which King James received was from that very section of the clergy who were his best friends, and who had been the most zealous advocates of non-resistance. Not content with the free exercise of the religion which he had chosen, the King was employing all the supposed privileges of the royal prerogative for the subversion of the Protestant Church. The hope of a reconciliation between the Church of England and the Church of Rome was gone. One other scheme remained, that of uniting the Nonconformists with the Roman Catholics against the Church of England. This appears to have been the Court policy at different eras in the reigns both of Charles and James. The royal power, being above law, might dispense with law; and it was readily concluded that if this power were exercised in favour of toleration to Nonconformists they would not object to its exercise. It would include freedom for Roman Catholics; and Churchmen, from their own doctrine of non-resistance, would not resist the wish of the King. These calculations were found not to be correct. When the famous 'Declaration for Liberty of Conscience' was published in 1687, the Nonconformists had scruples about accepting it, because they did not believe in the prerogative from which it originated.* Permission was given to all persons to hold religious assemblies. The penal laws were not to be executed, the Test Acts were to be suspended, and the oaths of supremacy and allegiance not required. Many of the Dissenters, not seeing all that was involved in

* The King says, 'We cannot but heartily wish that all the people of our dominions were members of the Catholic Church, yet we humbly thank Almighty God it is and hath a long time been our constant sense and opinion that conscience ought not to be constrained nor people forced in matters of mere religion. We therefore, out of our princely care and affection to all our loving subjects, have thought fit, by virtue of our royal prerogative, to issue forth this our Declaration of Indulgence, making no doubt of the concurrence of our two Houses of Parliament, when we shall think it convenient for them to meet. In the first place, we do declare that we will protect and maintain our archbishops, bishops, and clergy, and all other subjects of the Church of England, in the free exercise of their religion, as by law established, and in the quiet and full enjoyment of all their possessions without any molestation or disturbance whatever.'

is exercise of the royal will, presented addresses ex- essing gratitude,* but the clergy who believed in the erogative made the distinction of which Burnet had nted to the King. When the order was passed in Council r this 'Declaration' to be read in all churches, as many shops as could come to London met at Lambeth. They mposed an address to the King, and pronounced the lispensing power' 'illegal,' as declared by the Parliament f 1662 and reaffirmed by that of 1672.†

The bishops oppose the exercise of the royal prerogative.

The bishops were prosecuted for 'affronting his Majesty id censuring him and his government.' After being sent the Tower they were tried at Westminster and acquitted, the great joy of the nation. On the day of their acquittal ie Prince of Orange was invited to England. In a few onths James had fled and William succeeded to the throne. he great body of the clergy at once took the oaths to the ew monarch. They professed, however, to retain the doc-

Are prosecuted and acquitted.

* When Charles tried the exercise his prerogative in the Declaration 1672, the Nonconformists generally garded this as the best way of setng the question. Dr. Robert Wilde, ie facetious Puritan poet, gives a umorous account in a letter to a iend of the joy which the news of ie 'Declaration' brought him in his tirement at Oundle. His wife was ying the tablecloth, which, in better ays, had been his 'horsecloth.' His aid had gone for mustard, and he as himself sitting with the frying- an on his knee, 'admiring the hissg music of four salt herrings which ad been in as bad a pickle almost as he Dutch fleet or the sons of the hurch at the reading the *Indulence* on the day before.' Hearing the ostboy's horn blowing near his winow, he knew that there was a letter r him. When he saw the 'Dieu et on Droit,' he laughed so loud that is wife ran with 'a herring tail anging out of her mouth to see what as the matter.'

† When the bishops presented the ldress, the King said, 'I did not exect this.' He pronounced it rebelous; 'the sounding of Sheba's trumet,' and worse than all 'the seditious reachings of the Puritans in the ear '40.' 'I hope,' said the Bishop f Bath and Wells, 'you will give that liberty to us which you allow to all mankind.' To which the Bishop of Peterborough added, 'The reading this Declaration is against our conscience.' The King asked, 'Do you question my dispensing power? Some of you have printed and preached for it when it was to your purpose;' adding, 'I will have my Declaration published.' The Bishop of Bristol answered, 'We will honour you, but we must fear God.' The address was subscribed by seven bishops: Sancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury; Lloyd, of St. Asaph's; Turner, of Ely; Lake, of Chichester; Ken, of Bath and Wells; White, of Peterborough; Trelawney, of Bristol. It had the approbation of Compton, of London; Lloyd, of Norwich; Frampton, of Gloucester; Ward, of Salisbury; Mew, of Winchester, and Lampleugh, of Exeter. Lloyd, of Norwich, did not receive the invitation, through a mistake of the postmaster. Mew was taken ill on his journey from Winchester to London. The Bishop of London was under suspension for refusing to suspend Dr. Sharp, Rector of St. Giles-in-the-Fields, and afterwards Archbishop of York, who had offended the King by preaching against Romanism. The Declaration was not read in more than two hundred churches throughout England.

CHAP. VII.

trine of hereditary right, and in various ways vindicated their consistency. Some alleged that William of Orange was King by right of conquest. He had not been set up by the authority of Parliament, which, they said, had no power to make or unmake kings, but by his army and navy conquering the nation. Others said that God, in the fulfilment of prophecy and by His own eternal decrees, had set William upon the throne, and therefore all the subjects of his nation should give him allegiance. A more favourite explanation was that James had abdicated, for by deserting the kingdom he had dethroned himself. It was therefore incumbent on the clergy to help to put another in his place, lest the nation should fall into a republic, which would have been the greatest of calamities. A fourth reason for taking the oaths to William was the command of St. Paul to submit to the powers that be. It was declared not to be the duty of subjects to inquire into the rights of princes, but to submit to those who were in possession of the kingdom.

Some were dissatisfied with all these reasons, and resigned their preferments rather than take the oaths to William and Mary. The last reason, however, was the cause of a great controversy, from its being defended by William Sherlock, who had written as strongly in favour of non-resistance, and who long scrupled to acknowledge William as King. Sherlock was now Master of the Temple, and, by the indulgence of the government, he had been permitted to hold his preferment after he had refused the oaths. His ultimate conversion was naturally ascribed to motives not the highest. His wife had always supported the Prince of Orange, and, according to Dr. Hickes, she 'sent in a man and horse' to his assistance. It was generally said that Sherlock's conversion was 'due to the devil and Mrs. Sherlock.' He published the reasons of his taking the oaths, vindicating himself from inconsistency. He still adhered to the doctrine of non-resistance, retracting only one passage of any significance. That was his explanation of St. Paul's words 'All power is of God,' which in his former tract, he had limited to 'legal' power. On this word 'legal,' and its bearing on the case of James and the Prince of Orange, the whole question turned.

The conversion of Dr. Sherlock.

CHAP. VII.

Sherlock's treatise was called 'The Case of the Allegiance due to Sovereign Powers Stated and Resolved According to Scripture and Reason and the Principles of the Church of England.' In the beginning, he purposely avoided the inquiry concerning the 'legal right' of William and Mary. That was a question not to be discussed, for no actual government would allow subjects to question its right. If the Revolution could be justified, Sherlock would find no difficulty in answering all objections to the new oaths. But he denies the necessity of going into that question at all. It is quite enough for him that the government of William and Mary is a settled government. It is therefore 'of God.' The powers that be 'are ordained of God.' With the origin and history of these powers, the question of our obedience has nothing to do. Sherlock, in the title of his tract, indicates that he does not confine himself to reason and Scripture. He even declared his principles to be those of the Church of England. His authority was the Convocation Book of Bishop Overall. By reading this book, he had been convinced that it was right to give allegiance to William and Mary. The Convocation Book had just been published for the first time by Archbishop Sancroft, and with the object of teaching the people to give allegiance only to King James. That the Church of England had been very careful to instruct her children in their duty to princes, and to obey the laws, was not denied on either side. 'But,' Sherlock added, 'she has withal taught, that all sovereign princes receive their power and authority from God, and therefore every prince who is settled in the throne is to be obeyed and reverenced by us as God's minister and not to be resisted; which directs us what to do in all revolutions of government, when once they come to a settlement, and those who refuse to pay obedience and swear to such princes whom God has placed on the throne, whatever their legal right be, do as much reject the doctrine of the Church of England, as those who teach the resistance of princes.'

He advocates allegiance to William and Mary.

His conversion due to Bishop Overall's 'Convocation Book.'

The Convocation Book, after speaking of the changes in government which God often makes for the sins of the people, says, 'the authority either so unjustly gotten, or

CHAP. VII.

wrung by force from the true and lawful possessor, being always God's authority, is ever to be reverenced and obeyed.' It is again said, that he greatly errs who supposes that in any new forms of government 'begun by rebellion, and after thoroughly settled, the authority of them is not of God,' or that 'the Jews in Egypt or Babylon might lawfully for any cause have taken up arms against any of these Kings.' The Convocation Book says that the Lord is not bound by the laws which He prescribes to others. He commanded Jehu, a subject, to be anointed king over Israel, purposely to punish the sins of Ahab and Jezebel. The Moabites and Ammonites could have no legal right to the government of Israel, and yet the Convocation Book says, that it was not lawful for the Israelites 'to take arms against the Kings, whose subjects they were, though indeed they were tyrants.' It was the same under the 'four monarchies,' which were all violent usurpations. Jaddus bound himself by an oath of allegiance to King Darius, but he transferred his allegiance to Alexander, as soon as Alexander conquered Darius. These principles, clearly laid down in the Convocation Book, were advocated by Sherlock, both from Scripture and reason. His argument was grounded on the belief that no event in the world happens merely by divine permission, but that God is the author of all good and all evil, either to private persons or public societies.

Sherlock's adversaries.

The answers to Dr. Sherlock were very numerous. Some of those who took the oaths were dissatisfied that he still advocated non-resistance, and those who did not take the oaths found his reasons valid only as mere excuses for retaining his preferments. Of the former class, was the author of the tract called, 'Remarks upon Dr. Sherlock's Book, intituled The Case of the Allegiance.' It was shown that on Dr. Sherlock's principles, those who opposed King John, Henry III., and Edward II. were rebels and traitors, though warranted by the laws of the land. The notion of irresistible authority in princes, the writer said, was not then hatched. It did not appear till long after the Reformation. Queen Elizabeth and her Parliament were of another opinion when they gave subsidies to relieve distressed subjects against their

princes. When Sibthorp and Mainwaring broached their traitorous positions in the time of Charles I., they were impeached in Parliament. And yet clergymen will have that to be the doctrine of the Church which would destroy the State and all human society. The writer denies that it is the doctrine of the Church of England, or that the Convocation Book can in any official way represent the Church of England. The canons of that Convocation never had the assent of Parliament, nor the King's Letters Patent. It is only a few of the clergy who believe that the Convocation, in any sense, is the representative body of the Church of England. Sherlock's doctrine is described as the principle of waiting till the battle is fought out, and then taking the side that wins. The 'late king' is admitted by Sherlock to have a 'legal right' to the crown, for 'God alters no legal right.' And from this it is inferred that Sherlock cannot acknowledge 'a legal right' in 'their present majesties.' He had made a distinction between the case of the Prince of Orange and that of Cromwell; for in the days of the latter, we had no King, no Lords, and but 'a part of the House of Commons.' To this the writer answers that the powers of that time were 'the powers that be,' and, on Sherlock's principles, were 'ordained of God.' It could not be said that in Cromwell's time there was no 'settlement;' for the Highlanders in Scotland were subdued, Ireland was reduced to subjection, and the government was acknowledged by all the princes and governments in Christendom.

His doctrine resolved into Might is Right.

Another writer on the same side wrote, 'Some Modest Remarks on Dr. Sherlock's New Book.' He wished that the Convocation Book might have the same effect on the Archbishop which it had on Dr. Sherlock. To take the oaths to William and Mary was right by all means, but to wait till a new government was settled after a revolution, was not an easy rule to follow. When is a government 'thoroughly settled'? Sherlock's answer is, when one power is driven out and another placed on the throne in the full administration of government. This is paralleled by the reasons which William Jenkyns addressed to Cromwell's Government for his being released from prison.

Cromwell's Government legalized by Sherlock's rule.

CHAP. VII.

Jenkins had been concerned in the Love Plot for the restoration of Charles II., but in prison he was convinced that under Cromwell the 'powers that be' were ordained of God. With Dr. Sherlock it is orthodox doctrine; with William Jenkyns it was only cant and enthusiasm. The writer says that Dr. Sherlock need not have hesitated so long about giving allegiance to William and Mary; for, had he known the constitution of this kingdom, he would have known that the two Houses of Parliament were sufficient to give a 'legal right.' But his principles are those of 'the heathens and Persians, that he who has the best success is favoured by heaven, and that God establishes the prosperous, right or wrong, and therefore he is resolved to adore the rising sun.' The writer also remarks that the bishops who authorized the Convocation Book had no intention of teaching the principles which Dr. Sherlock had learned from it. The royal prerogative was the idol of the bishops in the reign of King James I. They were mostly favourers of the Spanish and French matches. ''Tis a thousand to one,' the writer adds, 'but that same bishop might be a member of this Convocation, who thanked God he had never read a line in Chaucer or Calvin, and in a sermon at Court made use of this simile, that our religion stood between two beasts, the Puritan and the Papist.'*

On the side of the Nonjurors there were also many replies to Sherlock. He had deserted them when the weight of his name and position was of importance to their cause. One was called 'The Trimming Court Divine.' The argument was, that as the Primate and some other of the bishops had not taken the oaths, there had not been a 'thorough settlement' of the new monarchy. There was another, called, 'An Answer to the late Pamphlet,' in which the author maintained that Sherlock had not given the right sense of the Convocation Book. He was said to have omitted many things necessary to the understanding of the subject. It was denied that the government under William and Mary was yet 'thoroughly settled.' Limerick, a place of power,

The Nonjurors deny that there has been a 'thorough' settlement.

* Another pamphlet on the same side was called. 'Sherlock against Sherlock,' placing the words of the Rector of St. George's, Botolph Lane, on one column, and on the other the opposing words of the Master of the Temple.

rust, and importance, had not been reduced to obedience. CHAP. VII.
)r. Sherlock mistakes the meaning of 'thoroughly settled' n the Convocation Book. The case of Athaliah is adduced. She had in her hands all places of power and trust for six 'ears, and yet the Convocation is so far from saying that)bedience was due to her, that they expressly justify re- isting her and putting her to death. Dr. Sherlock's doc- rine is said to be inconsistent with the main and funda- nental doctrine of the book, while he indirectly censures the worthies of the Church of England who suffered be- ween the years forty-two and sixty.'

Of the Nonjuring answers the most important was written y Dr. Hickes. It was called, 'A Vindication of Some among hurselves against the False Principles of Dr. Sherlock.' It ad reference to 'The Case of Allegiance,' and also to a ser- ion preached in the Temple Church on the 29th of May, 692. In a dedication to the Benchers, the preacher says ie law of England is divided by an eminent lawyer into hree parts—*Lex Ecclesiæ, Lex Coronæ,* and *Lex Terræ.* If)r. Sherlock's doctrine be correct, that providential posses- ion supersedes *Lex Coronæ* and gives a usurper a divine ight to the Crown, then in the other cases the Pope may ave a divine right to the Church of England if he can get ossession of it, and the King a divine right to the estates f his subjects if he can only make them his own by force. he pamphlet is in the form of a letter, and Dr. Sherlock . informed that his sermons are 'pitiful,' not 'fit for the ress,' and that he has written many wretched pieces since e took the oaths. He was told, further, that 'though he ad made the right of William and Mary to depend on their ossession, ignoring abdication and vacancy, the principle n which the Convocation had proceeded, yet in his sermon efore the House of Commons he had servilely justified the evolution, on the plea that King James had abdicated and herefore the throne was vacant.' It was easy, in the judg- ent of Hickes, to divine the reason which had most weight ith Sherlock. 'A providential king in possession,' he id, 'hath bishoprics and deaneries at his disposal, but ie legal king out of possession hath nothing to bestow.' ickes' pamphlet is not so much a vindication of those

Dr. Hickes answers Sherlock.

CHAP. VII.

who did not take the oaths as an accusation against thos who did.*

Every effort was made by the government and the leadin Churchmen to retain the Nonjurors in the Church. Bu this was impossible so long as they refused the oaths. The maintained that they were the Church of England, an under this pretence they continued the exercise of thei spiritual functions. A schism was the result, and the usua question followed as to which side the real cause of th schism was due. Dr. Stillingfleet, already famed for hi opposition to the Nonconformists, wrote 'A Discourse Con cerning the Unreasonableness of the New Separation.' I was to him surprising that those who had been so zealou against separation should themselves so easily fall int schism. They had often urged on the Nonconforming min isters to be content with the place assigned them by th authorities of the Church, that of lay members, but wh were not the Nonjurors satisfied with the same place Taking the oaths was not made a condition of communion Those who did take them might be perfectly conscientiou in so doing, why then should the Nonjurors refuse to com municate with them? Stillingfleet argued that the genera good absolved men from the oath taken to King James. No oath, not even a vow to God, is binding on men, when it interferes with a manifest good. The case of a slave is instanced. The best writers are said to be agreed that if a slave be kept in chains, he is under no obligation of conscience to his master. Stillingfleet defended the doctrine of passive obedience, but he denied that in the Church of England it ever meant anything else but allegiance to a king or queen actually in possession. It was objected that, according to the casuists, no oath ought to be taken to the prejudice of a third person. To which Stillingfleet answers, that it is also a principle among the casuists that no oath ought to be taken against the public good. Again,

Stillingfleet writes against the New Separation.

* There was published at Amsterdam, in 1689, 'A History of Passive Obedience.' On this work Samuel Johnson wrote 'Reflections.' The 'History' is abundant in citations from Scripture, Fathers, formularies of the Church of England, and writings of her divines, to prove that the King is the minister of God. Johnson's answer is, that the King is so as long as he does what is right. King James II. became 'the minister of the devil.'

CHAP. VII.

was said that an oath should not be taken contrary to a rmer oath; to which the answer is, that the former oath is ɔt in force when it is repugnant to the welfare of the ɜtion. Cases are produced from English history where legiance was transferred without regard to a former oath. he Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Bishops of Win- ıester and Salisbury, with the majority of the English ɔbility, did not hesitate to give allegiance to Stephen, notithstanding their oath to Maud, the daughter of Henry I. ıother case was that of King John, who was merely king *facto*, elected by the people, as Archbishop Hubert de- ɜred at the coronation. Yet, as Duke of York, he had ken an oath of allegiance to Henry V. so long as he lived. ıe three estates of the realm put this oath aside because the public good. The passages in the Homilies which ndemn rebellions and revolutions are explained as refer- ıg to the usurpations of the Popes, and their disposition disturb kingdoms. It was also shown that some of the ɔman emperors, to whom allegiance is commanded in the ɜw Testament, were chosen by the armies, or made empe- rs by right of conquest.

Proves from English history the lawfulness of the new oaths.

Stillingfleet was briefly answered by Samuel Grascombe, d vindicated by Dr. John Williams, who defended the ths to William and Mary as agreeable to the laws and nstitution of this realm. Though the government was mpelled to inflict penalties on those of the clergy who re disobedient, yet these penalties, Williams said, did not ect them as members of the Church. They could not iciate as ministers, but they could continue in communion members. They were the very men who had always ed out most vehemently against schism, yet they will ther destroy the Church than suffer inconvenience to emselves. The civil power does not profess to make or make either bishops or priests, but it has a right to prive men who refuse that allegiance which is necessary good government. Their conduct was often contrasted th that of the Nonconformists, who, as a rule, continued receive the sacraments at church, and though unwilling be silent, conformed so far as in conscience they could nform. Samuel Grascombe replied to Williams that it

The Nonjurors and schism.

CHAP. VII.

was impossible for the Nonjurors to continue members the Church of England, so long as the names of Willia and Mary were found in the Prayer Book. The oath, l maintained, was really made a condition of communion.

The Non-juring bishops.

Eight bishops,* and, it is said, about four hundred clerg men, refused to take the oaths.† The bishops were Sa croft, Archbishop of Canterbury; Turner, Bishop of Ely Lloyd, of Norwich; White, of Peterborough; Thomas, Worcester; Frampton, of Gloucester; Ken, of Bath a Wells; and Lake, of Chichester. Sancroft had been raise to the Primacy on the death of Sheldon in 1678. He w a High Churchman, but like the highest Churchmen of th age, a decided Protestant. It was supposed that he w made Archbishop of Canterbury in the hope that he mig be used as an instrument to bring in the Roman Cathol religion. If this supposition be correct, those who promoted the appointment were certainly deceived. Sancroft's disposition was gentle, and his character vacillating, but som times he could be firm. He left no writings, if we except thr sermons that were preached on public occasions. He had great aversion to allow anything he wrote to be printed. Perhaps he knew, as Macaulay has shown, that his English could not bear criticism. The occasions of the three sermons were, the first consecration of bishops after the Restoration,‡ the solemn fast after the Fire of London, and a fast for imploring the mercies of God in the protection of Charles II. during 'the Popish Plot.'

Sancroft's sermon at the first consecration after the Restoration.

The first sermon is the only one which has any theological interest. It is a defence of Episcopacy against the 'modern platform' of Geneva and the usurpations of the Papacy. The text is about Titus being left in Crete to ordain presbyters, called also bishops, in every city. This convertibility of the words presbyters and bishops was the strength of the argument advanced by the Presbyterians. But Sancroft says, that though a bishop may be called a presbyter,

* Some include Cartwright, of Chester, who had to leave England after the Revolution.

† The list at the end of Kettlewell's works does not amount to more than 220.

‡ The bishops were Cosin, of Durham; Lucy, of St. David's; Laney, of Peterborough; Sterne, of Carlisle; Walton, of Chester; and Gauden, of Exeter.

a single presbyter is never called a bishop. The text is explained on the supposition that Titus was Archbishop or Metropolitan of Crete. He was to consecrate a bishop for every city in the island, and to govern these bishops as his suffragans. The Apostles in this way gave grace to their ccessors, and that grace has come down to us, even as the l on Aaron's beard flowed down to the skirt of his garent. The model of Church government was set up at ete, and Sancroft addressed the Presbyterians in the rds of St. Paul, when there was danger of shipwreck, irs, ye should not have parted from Crete,' and so 'have ined harm and disgrace.' The modern Titus was chbishop Juxon, who was consecrating a whole province bishops at once. We have, now, Crete in England. th islands are a kind of trigon betwixt three points or omontories. Both are called by ancient writers 'the ppy islands,' and both were called 'white,' because on e side they were bounded by cliffs of chalk,—'*Candia candidis*, as Albion *ab albis rupibus*.' The parallel is ious, but, like most parallels strictly followed out, it rders on burlesque. St. Paul quoted a poet, who said that Cretans were always liars. A prophet he was, Sancroft ds, and prophesied of this present age that it might 'see face and blush.' The English nation, but lately, had ndered 'the Lord's anointed.' They had accused the thren and the fathers, that they might devour men re righteous than themselves. Pliny says, that there s no poisonous animal in Crete,' and Solinus adds, that ad no serpents; but he should have excepted the inhaants, who were 'evil beasts,' and not only evil, but 'venous.' In this, too, we resemble Crete. We have vipers that e eaten out the bowels of their common mother. Grotius s, that the Cretans were a mutinous and seditious people, l it were to be wished that in this the English nation had been like them. We have also had a 'Cretan labyrinth,' n endless maze of errors and heresies; and, in the labyth, an hideous monster, a 'Minotaur semibovemque virum, ivirumque bovem, Rome and Geneva, Cracovia, ay, and cca too.' But now we have a Theseus to slay the monster, l an Ariadne to lend the clue. We have the restoration

Crete and England compared.

CHAP. VII.

of the Apostolic government, the 'Cretan model,' a Metropolitan with a whole province of bishops.

This sermon was preached when Sancroft was comparatively a young man. Its style is antiquated and its idea exploded. He had inherited more of the past than the leading divines who were of his age; and but for the great events that happened during his Primacy, he would have been passed by as the most insignificant of the Reformed Archbishops of Canterbury. His refusing to take the oath to William might have been pardoned, but no man now approves of his conduct in separating from the communion of the Church of England, and taking steps to perpetuate the schism of the Nonjurors. Yet a man who, for conscience sake, could give up the revenues of the See of Canterbury and live contentedly in obscurity on fifty pounds a year, is deserving of admiration, whatever his weaknesses may have been. When there was danger of Roman Catholicism being introduced by stealth into England, Sancroft counselled a friendly alliance with Nonconformists. He instructed the clergy to have a very tender regard for Protestant Dissenters; they were, 'upon occasions, offered, to visit them at their houses, and receive them kindly at their own, and treat them fairly whenever they meet them, discoursing calmly and civilly with them, persuading them, if it may be, to a full compliance with the Church, or at least, that, whereunto we have already attained we may walk by the same rule and mind the same thing.'

Sancroft recommends a friendly alliance with Nonconformists.

Bishop Ken.

Thomas Ken, Bishop of Bath and Wells, is the best known of the Nonjuring bishops. He is one of the few men who, belonging to one party, have yet preserved the esteem of all parties. Ken's intellect was not great, but like some narrow streams, it was pure and beautiful. A few successful lines in two hymns, among volumes of very poor verses, have almost done for him what the Elegy in a Country Churchyard has done for Thomas Gray. By these lines he is remembered by many who have forgotten or never known that he was a Nonjuror. But the cause of the Nonjurors does not gain much from Ken. He was the last to decide on the refusal of the oath, and the first to deplore the schism which followed. Macaulay has shown that the difference

etween Ken and the Whigs was not a difference of prin- ple. He would have given allegiance to William, if it had een true, as it was reported, that James had ceded Ireland the French king. So that Ken recognised a point where sistance was a duty. In a letter to Dr. Hickes, in 1700,* e earnestly recommended the other Nonjurors to resign eir canonical claims and communicate in public offices ith the Church. The ground on which he advised this as that the peace of the Church should supersede all clesiastical canons, which at best were only of human thority.

A narrow Churchman.

Ken, however, belonged entirely to the narrow Church arty which embraced the Nonjurors. The Latitudina- ans, as they were called, were in his judgment scarcely hristians. They were regarded as men who had betrayed eir baptismal faith.† Bishop Burnet was a mere traducer f the Church. But, like all really devout High Churchmen, en was a zealous advocate for keeping 'holy the Sabbath ay.' The day of rest, under the gospel, was delivered, he id, from Jewish rigour, but not from the piety of the ewish Sabbath. He kept to the 'real presence' in the ucharist, in the sense described by Dryden, when he wrote,

'Nonsense never can be understood.'

en had piety, firmness of character,‡ and, what is better an either orthodox or even rational theology, he had a ving faith in righteousness. 'There is,' he says, in one f his sermons, 'nothing stable but virtue; nothing that can eep us steady in all revolutions but the love of God; and hen the worldly wise men and the mighty fail by their wn weakness, or moulder by the decays of time, or wear ut of fashion, or are overwhelmed by a deluge of envy, or re blown away by the breath of God's displeasure, or when ie world of its own accord frowns and forsakes them and heir name and memory perish, the man that loves God is till the same; God whom he loves is still the same; with

* Prose Works, p. 49.
† Prose Works, p. 67.
‡ When Charles II. asked the use Ken's prebendal residence at Winchester for Nell Gwynne, Ken answered, 'Not for his whole kingdom.' It is said that for this Charles made him a bishop.

CHAP. VII.

Him is no variableness or shadow of turning.'* In a funeral sermon on Lady Mainard, there is a charming picture of a devout woman whose piety was of Ken's own type.

His sermon on Daniel.

In the celebrated sermon on Daniel, preached at Whitehall, Ken has sketched the character and conduct of Daniel in words which are generally regarded as applicable to himself. The text is 'O Daniel, a man greatly beloved.' The Hebrew youth had kept himself uncorrupted by the luxury or religion of the king. He was afraid to break the law of his own religion in eating the meat offered to Bel. He refused to obey the decree which forbade him to ask a petition from any god or man except from the king. 'For Daniel, personally, it was grievous to offend Darius, who had been to him a gracious and indulgent master. When his duty to God and obedience to his king stood in competition, though it was an inexpressible grief to the good man that ever there should be such a competition, he obeyed God.'†

Bishop Turner.

Francis Turner, Bishop of Ely, published several occasional sermons and some tracts. The most important of the latter was an answer to Bishop Croft, called 'Animadversions on Naked Truth.' It was written several years before Turner was a bishop and published without his name. Bishop Croft's book was also anonymous. Turner did not know against whom he was writing. The author of 'Naked Truth' is not spoken of in the most courteous language. His Christianity is regarded as defective, and his faith in God's 'Vicegerent,' Charles II., as not what it ought to be. The argument of 'Naked Truth' was directed against the multitude of creeds and impositions that were now made necessary to salvation. Bishop Croft pointed to the simplicity of faith, as described in the New Testament. Philip spent but a short time in catechizing the Ethiopian eunuch. He only required the confession that Jesus is the Christ, and then he proceeded to baptism. Turner's answer is that which would be given by any orthodox advocate of the creeds in the present day. The subsequent creeds are only

Answers 'Naked Truth.'

* Prose Works, p. 171.

† An incorrect account of this sermon was carried to the king. Ken was summoned to appear before James, when he was charged with preaching against him. Ken answered that if his majesty had not neglected his duty of being present, his enemies would not have had this opportunity of accusing him.

mplified forms of the doctrines expressed in the Apostles' Creed. As new heresies arose, new and more decisive definitions of the faith had to be made. The Apostles' Creed is admitted to contain all that is necessary to salvation, on the ground that it contains the substance of all the other creeds. A description of the Thirty-nine Articles is taken from Bishop Laney. They are called 'Articles of Peace,' but not in the sense of comprehending men of different views. Neither are they new articles of faith. They are articles which are to express the opinions of all the clergy on certain controversies. That they are not articles of faith is supposed to be proved from the fact that subscription is not required from the laity.

Disputes the brevity of the Christian creed.

The brevity of the creed of the Ethiopian eunuch is disputed. He may have had longer instruction, and he may have learned more than appears from the narrative. His confession was that Jesus is the Christ, but surely, Turner says, he had learned of the third Person in the Trinity. Philip's baptism must have embraced more than the baptism of those who did not know whether there be any Holy Ghost. The formula of baptism in the name of the Trinity must itself have taught him more than the mere sonship of Christ. The immersion in the water was a lesson of dying into sin, and the emersion, of a life unto righteousness. Socinians, yea Mahometans, believe that Jesus is the Christ. The confession of Philip must therefore have included more than the words seem to imply. It must have been equivalent to that of Peter, 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.' And in this case, it was the rock on which Christ built His Church. To the plea that we should always express doctrine in Scripture language, Turner makes the very sensible answer that we cannot. If the things taught in the Scriptures are to be taken up by the human intellect, they must be expressed in such words as the human mind can invent to express them. Though Bishop Croft was on the Liberal side, his argument evidently supposed some special virtue in the words of Scripture over ordinary human speech. Turner, unconscious probably of the whole bearing of what he maintained, said that we could not escape making deductions or inferences

CHAP. VII.

from the Scriptures. It is useless to exalt reason, and abuse reasoning. The Schoolmen, Turner says, had a noble design: they wished to systematize divinity, to arrange it in such an order as that the whole matter might be seen at once. This approbation of the Schoolmen is an admission of the necessity of reasoning in matters which concern religion. It supposes that the truth received is in proportion to the capacity of the receiving mind, and that by reasoning, reason itself is made perfect.

Recommends that people be compelled to go to Church.

In Turner's treatise, we can discern some of the peculiar marks of the 'good churchman' of this age. He says that the civil magistrate should compel the people to give the clergy a fair hearing. It is admitted that they cannot be compelled to believe the gospel, but after they have been compelled to hear it, the responsibility of not believing rests with themselves. The example of the Pope is commended, who compels all the Jews in Rome to hear one sermon every week. It is denied that a bishop is free to follow his own judgment. Bishops were always subject to general councils, and it is altogether incredible that God would permit a free general council to err in matters of faith. A general council is supposed to represent the majority of the bishops, either by their presence or by their suffrages. Turner, however, was a decided Protestant, though he advocated a great many 'Catholic' ceremonies. He defended bowing towards the altar, but he denied, with emphasis, that this is done because of any supposed corporal presence of Christ. It is done, he says, when there is no communion, which is a demonstration that there is no intention of reverence for any real presence.

Bishop Thomas.

William Thomas, Bishop of Worcester, was also author of a few tracts and sermons. One tract, called 'Roman Oracles Silenced,' confirms what is evident of all the Nonjurors, that they had no sympathy with the Church of Rome, or with the Roman doctrines condemned in our Articles. 'Roman Oracles' was an answer to a work of Henry Tuberville, appealing to antiquity in defence of the Roman Catholic religion. The Bishop's answer is only a fragment, and was left unfinished at his death. The true Church of England ground is maintained, that our only

ppeal is to the Scriptures, yet if the Church of Rome wishes the battle to be fought on the ground of antiquity, we are willing to fight it even there. The Church of Rome, the Bishop says, may have an unbroken succession of bishops, though he doubts if even that can be proved. But a succession of bishops is no security for a succession of true doctrine. By many testimonies from the Fathers, it is shown that the doctrines of the Church of Rome are not those of the early Church.

The most eminent of the Nonjuring clergy were Dr. Hickes, Thomas Wagstaffe, John Kettlewell, Jeremy Collier, and Charles Leslie. At the time of the separation, Dr. Hickes* was Dean of Worcester. Besides his controversial writings, which were chiefly on the subject of the oaths, he wrote some learned works on the Saxon and other Northern languages. In 1713, he published two volumes of sermons which had been preached at different times, chiefly on public occasions. These sermons may be taken as specimens of the ordinary teaching of the loyal Churchmen, in the time of the second Charles. In one which was preached on the 29th of May, 1684, Charles is called 'the stone which the builders rejected,' but which 'has now become the head stone of the corner.' The prophecy of Ezekiel, concerning the ruin and restoration of the house of Judah, was thought to have had 'a second fulfilment in the wonderful, if not plainly miraculous restoration of King Charles.' The people cried out as if it were by 'inspiration,' *Hosanna to the King!* 'Rebels and traitors, Papists and Church robbers, united with loyal Churchmen, to hail the return of the Lord's anointed.' Ethiopians changed their skins and leopards their spots. Lions associated with lambs,

Dr. Hickes' sermons.

Charles II. the head stone of the corner.

* 'He was the younger brother of that unfortunate John Hickes, who had been found hidden in the malthouse of Alice Lisle. James had, in spite of all solicitation, put both John Hickes and Alice Lisle to death. Persons who did not know the strength of the Dean's principles, thought that he might possibly feel some resentment on this account, for he was of no gentle or forgiving temper, and could retain during many years, a bitter remembrance of small injuries. But he was strong in his religious and political faith; he reflected that the sufferers were Dissenters, and he submitted to the will of the Lord's anointed, not only with patience, but with complacency. He became, indeed, a more loving subject than ever, from the time when his brother was hanged and his brother's benefactress beheaded.'—*Macaulay's History of Eng.* vol. iii. p. 459.

CHAP. VII.

and wolves with kids. The *veterans in blood* even prayed for the king as he passed their ranks. The spirit of grace and supplication had been poured out upon them, that with repentance and sorrow *they might look on him whom they had pierced.* The kings of the earth esteemed him *smitten of God and afflicted;* but God said of him, as of Cyrus His anointed, *He is my Shepherd.* Cromwell was the great image in Nebuchadnezzar's vision, but Charles was 'the stone which smote the image and became a great mountain, even like Mount Zion, which shall never be removed, but is the joy of the whole earth.'

Hickes says that the Church and State in England have two enemies,—the Papists and the Nonconformists. Both were enemies of the State, for both claimed the right to dethrone kings if their deeds were evil. But both were enemies of the Church. There is no trace in these sermons of any disposition to regard the errors of the Church of Rome as of small importance. Primitive truth and Catholic truth were to Dr. Hickes the same as Protestant truth. The Church of England, in the name of the primitive Church, protested against the heresies of the Church of Rome. It is, therefore, strictly and truly Protestant. No Puritan ever condemned more strongly the Roman doctrine of the real presence. Speaking of the 'great' wafer, which is said to be 'very Christ,' Dr. Hickes says, 'This they keep in a pix on purpose, and on solemn days carry it in procession, as the Pagans did their idols, to be adored; and wherever it is met the people must fall down and worship, and wheresoever the priest makes a stand there must be prayers offered up unto it, as unto the very Christ. The heathens were never guilty of more gross and more absurd idolatry than this. The worshipping of a leek or an onion, or an head of garlic, as the Egyptians did, is not more against common sense and reason than the worshipping of a wafer, the work of a baker, or confectioner's shop.'* His views of justification by faith, and of the imputation of Christ's righteousness, are also altogether Protestant. In a sermon on the praise and honour due to the Virgin Mary, he condemns with great decision the Mary-worship of

Hickes on the 'Real Presence.'

* Vol. i. p. 197.

the Church of Rome. From many prayers and hymns he shows that Roman Catholics in their worship have deified Mary. He quotes a curious parody on the 'Te Deum,' approved by Pope Paul V., but condemned by a later pope. It begins thus:—

> 'We praise Thee, O Mary;
> We acknowledge Thee to be The Lady;
> All the earth doth worship Thee,
> The Mother of the Everlasting God.'

There is nothing in Dr. Hickes' own views of what is due to Mary that would offend any Protestant. We except only the use of the phrase 'mother of God.' It was used by some of the Fathers, and therefore all must use it who aspire to be 'Catholic' Churchmen. Yet Dr. Hickes, in the very page in which he uses it, quotes the words of the Athanasian creed, which declare that Christ was 'God, of the substance of His Father, begotten before the world, and *man* of the substance of His mother, born in the world.'

Regarding the doctrines of the Church of Rome as subversive of Christianity, Dr. Hickes defended the French Protestants in their refusal to submit to the authority of Church or State in France. Their position is compared to that of the first Christians, who were under the necessity of disobeying the supreme authority. This is maintained in a curious sermon on 'The True Notion of Persecution.' When heretics are persecuted, that is considered to be only just punishment. But when men suffer for the truth, they are truly persecuted. Heretics suffer not as Christians, but as criminals. They are neither confessors nor martyrs. They shall not receive the promised reward of suffering in the world to come. The same doctrine was laid down by the Roman Catholic bishops in the days of Queen Mary, when they burned Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer. Modern High Churchmen have given up the cause of the Huguenots with that of all reformed unepiscopal churches. But Dr. Hickes pleaded, that though they had not bishops they were willing to have them; and if the bishops of France would receive the doctrines of the Reformation, the French Protestants would then be willing to submit to their jurisdiction. This willingness to receive the Apostolic order neces-

On the French Protestants.'

CHAP. VII.

sary to constitute a Church went a long way to justify the French Protestants. But the English Nonconformists, who rejected that order, were mere fanatics and enthusiasts. Spiritual worship, like what the Quakers advocated, was pronounced 'blasphemy.' And the ground of this judgement was, that Quakers supposed the Spirit to descend now upon religious assemblies, as it did in the days of the Apostles.* †

John Kettlewell.

Next after Ken, John Kettlewell, Vicar of Coleshill, in Warwickshire, was the best of the Nonjurors. He had great industry,‡ and what we may call a genius for practical religion. His peculiar theological views, and the importance which he attached to them, are sufficiently manifest in his works. But he is always clear on the essentials of religion, in which all Christians are professedly agreed. His notions about the virtue of sacraments, and the necessity of Church membership for the attainment of everlasting life, are sometimes offensive. But, to atone for this, he is free from the doctrines too frequent in the most pious Puritan writers, which limit Divine mercy to a channel quite as narrow and arbitrary.

The curious Churchism which arose after the Restoration was a combination of rational religion with submission to authority. The authority was never well defined, and the rational ingredient was chiefly the result of antagonism to the theology of the Puritans. All Christians believe that salvation, in a sense, depends on the receiving of Christianity. Salvation, as explained by Kettlewell, is 'endless comfort,' and its contrary is 'endless torment.' The Puritan, that is, the Calvinist, settled by an eternal decree who were to embrace Christianity and who were not. The Churchman, that is, the consistent logical High Churchman, said it depended on membership with a true Church, in which sacraments were properly administered. When either of these parties explained themselves, practically they were compelled to neutralize their own positions. If they did not, they said something outrageous. When Ket-

* Hickes, vol. i. p. 102.

† Thomas Wagstaffe published several tracts, but they are entirely on the nonjuring controversy, and contain nothing that was not said by other writers.

‡ Kettlewell died at the age of forty-two, yet his collected works make two folio volumes.

CHAP. VII.

ewell lays down the conditions of salvation, he first explains faith as submission to authority,—believing what is old us on the authority of another. Then he explains that his faith, by the figure metonymy, means obedience. The nd and object of faith is, to produce obedience to the laws hich the Gospel declares necessary to eternal life. We re to believe what God has revealed. This includes in itelf true obedience, for works are sure to follow a genuine ith. Then it turns out, in the course of the argument, hat revelation is not measured by Christianity. It includes verything which God reveals, whether mediately by a ritten revelation, or immediately to the natural reason. ome things, he says, are revealed by the light of nature. his light in the spirit of a man is 'the candle of the ord.' All matters of knowledge become matters of faith, ecause they rest on 'God's revelation.' By natural faith e know 'that there is a God, and that He is the rewarder f them that diligently seek Him.'

His rational explanations of faith and revelation.

Notwithstanding these explanations of faith, we are not o conclude that Kettlewell admitted the wide sense in hich faith in Christ was understood by such Fathers as the lexandrian Clement. Their tendency was antagonistic to he peculiarities of Kettlewell's theology. He still idenifies believing in Christ with being a member of the Church. He does not say expressly that out of the Church there is o salvation. He puts it in the modified form, which, for ractical purposes, is virtually the same, that out of the hurch there is no assurance of salvation. The resolution f revelation into knowledge, and of faith into obedience, if lone in the Alexandrian spirit, would exclude mere authority, nd bring the credenda of Christianity within the province f the reason or the light of conscience. But this would essen the importance of the uncomprehended dogmas, the mysteries, and the positive rites, while with these is inseparably interwoven the religion of men who have not passed the stage represented by John Kettlewell.

Limits his explanations.

The baptismal waters wash away sin not by a figure but n reality. The visible Church is the body of Christ as truly s the members of a man's body are parts of his body. Before any spiritual influence can come from Christ to men,

Attaches great importance to the mere rites of religion.

CHAP. VII.

they must be within the pale of the Church. He works efficaciously in the members of the Church through ordinances that He has appointed. The chief of these is the Supper or Communion of His body and blood. Here we feast upon a sacrifice. Here we offer unto God a commemoration of the death of His Son, and thus present the argument which is most efficacious for obtaining divine mercies. The Communion Table was an awful mystery to John Kettlewell. It was a table spread for him in the wilderness in the midst of his ghostly enemies. The well-springs of salvation were there. The heavenly manna was there, not in any figure of speech, but in a reality which might be either spiritual or material. He was overawed by the presence of the heavenly food, and even wondered why it should only be eaten, and not 'adored.'

Defends passive obedience.

Kettlewell wrote an answer to Sherlock's 'Case of Allegiance,' and some other pieces on the subject of passive obedience. These need not trouble us here, as he said but little which was not said by other advocates of the same cause. With a misapprehension of the genius of Christianity, perfectly in character with the constitution of his mind, Kettlewell supposed that the conditions under which the first Christians had to live were applicable to all Christians in all times. Christianity he called a suffering religion, and therefore true Christians should seek for persecution, that their virtues may be perfected. The precepts of the gospel he supposes to forbid resistance to princes, however wicked they may be. The very spirit of resistance is said to be opposed to the spirit of Christianity. This is proved by many arguments and by many passages from Christ and His Apostles, from the history of the Jews, and from the practice of the first Christians under the Roman Emperors. Our business is to bear the cross, and not to stand up for legal right. Kettlewell called the prayers for William and Mary in the Prayer Book 'immoral.' This he held to be a sufficient reason for separation from the Established Church. There is a long letter in the 'Life' prefixed to his works, showing the sinfulness of the oaths to William and Mary, and justifying the schism. It was addressed to a clergyman who had taken the oaths against his conscience.

a clergyman addressed to the deprived Bishop of Norwich penitent letter of confession, bewailing his awful sins in making the house of Stuart. He begged to be again admitted to 'the peace of the Church,' and hoped that his repentance would cause joy in heaven!

Jeremy Collier is best known from his 'Ecclesiastical History,' his 'Historical Dictionary,' and his tracts on the immorality of the stage. The best evidence we can have of the genuine sincerity of Collier's mind is his opposition to the stage. This was something altogether uncommon with a Churchman of his party. It was supposed that only a Puritan could interfere with the liberty of the theatre. Collier had to bear the reproach of being successor to William Prynne, the scourge of actors in the reign of the first Charles. But if the theatres were bad in the time of Charles I., what could they have been under Charles II.? It was no abstract question of the good or evil influence of the drama. It was no question whether or not the theatre might be made conducive to the morality of the people. The fact was patent. The theatres were haunts of vice. The plays of the chief play-writers of the time were full of profanity and immorality. Collier compared the plays of Dryden, Wycherley, and Congreve, with the plays of the old Greeks and Romans, and found the latter to excel in morality and modesty. He quoted the testimonies of the Fathers of the Church against the influence of the stage, and he specially complained that by modern plays the clergy are ridiculed, which he held equivalent to the ridicule of religion.*

Jeremy Collier.

The immorality of the stage.

In 1703, after the great storm, Collier wrote a 'Dissuasive from the Play House, in a Letter to a Person of Quality, Occasioned by the late Calamity of the Tempest.' He regarded the great tempest as a punishment for the open profligacy of the nation, of which the stage was but too faithful a representative. In the conclusion he says: 'We

The great storm and the stage.

* This work was answered by Congreve, and led to a great controversy. Collier wrote a defence of his treatise, and other writers were engaged on both sides. Collier's treatise is called 'A Short View of the Immorality and Prophaneness of the English Stage.' Congreve wrote 'Amendments of Collier's False Citations.' Collier answered in 'A Defence of the Short View.' An anonymous author wrote 'Animadversions on Mr. Congreve's late Answer.' 'The Ancient and Modern Stage Surveyed,' another answer to Collier, was also anonymous.

CHAP. VII.

have lately felt a sad instance of God's judgments in the terrible tempests, terrible beyond anything of that kind in memory or record. For not to enlarge on the lamentable wrecks and ruins, were we not almost swept into a chaos? Did not nature seem to be in her last agony, and the world ready to expire? And if we go on still in such sins of defiance, may we not be afraid of that punishment of Sodom, and that God should destroy us with fire and brimstone? What impression this late calamity has made upon the playhouse, we may guess by their acting Macbeth, with all its thunder and tempest, the same day; where, at the mention of the chimneys being blown down, the audience was pleased to clap at an unusual length of pleasure and approbation. And is not the meaning of all this too intelligible? Does it not look as if they had a mind to brave out the judgment, and make us believe the storm was nothing but an eruption of Epicurus' atoms, a spring-tide of matter and motion, and a blind sally of chance? This throwing Providence out of the scheme, is an admirable opiate for the conscience; and when recollection is laid asleep, the stage will recover, of course, and go on with their business effectively.' Some of the Nonjurors regarded this storm as sent specially in their behalf, because it killed Bishop Kidder in his palace at Wells.

The Usages controversy.

Collier has also left some tracts on what was called the Controversy of the Usages, which was the occasion of a division among the Nonjurors in the beginning of the eighteenth century. He wanted to restore the first Prayer Book of Edward VI., because it had more ceremonies than the authorized book. There were prayers for the dead, a variety of dresses, mixing water with the Eucharistic wine, and some other things which even now are not unknown.

Charles Leslie.

Dr. Johnson says that there was only one of the Nonjurors who was a good reasoner. That one was Charles Leslie. He was the son of Dr. John Leslie, who had been successively bishop of the Isles, of Clogher, and of Derry. Charles Leslie was born in 1650. He studied law at the Temple, in London, but in 1680 he entered into Holy Orders. In 1687 he was made Chancellor of the Cathedral of Connor, where his capacity for dialectics was first exercised against

he Roman Catholics. James II. gave the see of Clogher to CHAP. VII.
Patrick Tyrrel, who openly professed the Roman Catholic religion. The bishop began his episcopal work by establishing convents and challenging the clergy of his diocese to a public disputation. Leslie accepted the challenge and defended Protestantism to the satisfaction of all Protestants. The appointment of a Roman Catholic bishop was followed by that of a sheriff of the same religion. Leslie persuaded the magistrates that it would be illegal for them to allow the sheriff to act. He was disqualified by his religion. The sheriff said that he was of the king's religion. Leslie answered that it was not a question of the king's religion. It was a question of law. The king's will is only known to his subjects through the law. Leslie was in fact the leader of the Protestants in Ireland against the arbitrary proceedings of the king. When it was dangerous for him to reside in Ireland he came to London, but the doctrine of passive obedience kept him on the side of James. It is said that he went so far as to maintain that James II., by becoming a Roman Catholic, had ceased to be 'defender of the faith' or 'head of the Church.'

Leslie's works, with the exception of his political pamph- His doctrines.
lets, are entirely controversial. He defended his opinions against Roman Catholics, Dissenters, Deists, Socinians, and Quakers. Concerning the first two he said nothing that requires to be repeated. His controversies with the last three we shall meet again. His own position was that of an orthodox Episcopalian, adhering rigidly to Church dogmas and holding Episcopacy necessary to the essence of a Church. He defends the doctrine of satisfaction for sin in the most absolute sense, founding it not merely on the justice of God, but on the abstract principle that God is justice. It was impossible, he says, that God could have been merciful, but by the scheme of substitution for the sins of men. Yet this literal substitution is held in union with an Arminian theology, and is in consequence exposed to the objection of satisfaction being made for some men who shall never be forgiven. The Church is constituted by the bishops. It is not a sect like the sects of the philosophers, but a society with governors appointed by Christ. All error is supposed

CHAP. VII.

to come into the Church through disobedience to the bishop. It is shown from Ephraim Pagitt's 'Heresiography' and Thomas Edwards' 'Gangrena,' that in the time of the Commonwealth there were sixty sects, the very number mentioned by Epiphanius. But on the restoration of the bishops in 1660, they almost immediately disappeared. Some might ascribe this to penal laws and test acts, but Leslie found a sublimer cause.

The arguments by which the Church of England Episcopacy is maintained against that of the Church of Rome might require special notice, were they not the argument frequently urged by others who thought as Leslie did. They are now abandoned by all consistent reasoners. Whatever authority is granted to bishops as such must be granted to the bishops of the Church of Rome in an equal measure with those of the Church of England. But while Leslie claimed authority for the bishops of the Church of England, he added explanations by which that authority was attenuated to nothingness. If bishops are heterodox, even the bishops of a whole nation, then the people must seek orthodox bishops from other nations.* Of course the test of orthodoxy is the doctrine of the Primitive Church. But in any case the people are the judges. They must determine whether or not their bishops agree in doctrine with the Primitive Church. This is no mere inference from Leslie's position. It really accords with what he says on private judgment, in a dialogue specially devoted to it. He denies that the Church of England ever claims authority in matters of faith. Its claim to authority never extends beyond rites and ceremonies or the government of the Church. The clause in Article XX., that the Church has 'authority in controversies of faith,' is paralleled by Chap. xxxi. in the Westminster Confession, that the Church is 'ministerially to determine controversies of faith.' It has authority, but that authority is not infallible. The Scriptures are the chart to guide the Christian traveller. The Church of Rome puts her authority above the Scriptures, and bids men trust blindly to her guidance. Leslie shows that the Church of England has a commission to be a guide, but the Dissenters

His views of episcopal authority.

* Leslie's Works, vol. i. p. 500.

ıave not. The value of this commission, which does not give the Church authority to teach doctrine or to interpret he Scriptures, we are not at present compelled to examine.

Henry Dodwell.

It would be a great omission to speak of the Nonjurors, ınd to pass by the learned but eccentric Henry Dodwell. He was not in orders, but theology was his favourite study. He wrote many books full of very odd things, for which nobody is responsible but himself. He builds, Bishop Ken aid, great things on feeble foundations. He had already aken a part in the Nonconformist controversy, and he had lso amused the world with a curious doctrine about the mmortality of the soul. The soul, he said, is naturally nortal, but it is made immortal by baptism, providing the erson baptizing has been properly ordained by a bishop. He distinguished between the soul and the spirit, quoting Plato and St. Paul, with many old philosophers and ancient Fathers, for the difference between the natural soul and the ntellectual or immortal spirit. Plato, in the 'Timæus,' had hown that the spirit was created by the supreme Deity, ut the soul, by the 'Demiurgus.' St. Paul had discoursed f the natural and spiritual body, and Philo did not really liffer either from Plato or St. Paul. It was shown from nany Fathers that this immortal spirit was joined to the body in baptism. The unbaptized Pagans, with all unchristened infants, having only mortal souls, when they die ease to exist. Those who have heard the Gospel and rejected it, and those who like Presbyterians, Independents, Baptists, and Quakers, have heard the Gospel, but have never become members of the body of Christ, that is, the Episcopal Church, shall have a terrible fate. They shall be kept in being, not by the favour of God, but by His will, that they may suffer a never ending punishment. Like Chorazin and Bethsaida they shall be cast into the nethermost hell, while merely psychical Pagans, who like the people of Sodom and Gomorrha, have been terribly wicked, shall go for a time to Hades, which is somewhere in the regions of the air. To consign to outer darkness the Nonconformists who had not received proper baptism, might seem uncharitable, but Dodwell atoned for it by the final annihilation of Pagans and unchristened infants, whom the

The soul made immortal by episcopal baptism.

CHAP. VII.

orthodox Nonconformists had given over to eternal perdition for the sin of Adam.

Dodwell took an active part in the nonjuring controversies. He defended the rights of the deprived bishops, on the ground that the State could not deprive them. The college of bishops alone could deprive a bishop. With his usual consistency, Dodwell carried out this principle, till he ended in a condemnation of the English Reformation. It was the State which deprived the bishops that refused the oaths of supremacy in 1559. If this deprivation was admitted to be just, then the same power which deprived them could surely deprive other bishops in 1689. The facts of the English Reformation were well known. Bonner, as well as Cranmer, had taken out commissions from the king to hold their sees. The Reformation was re-established under Elizabeth by the State. All these things, in Dodwell's judgment, were errors of our 'dear mother,'* and all done contrary to 'primitive antiquity.' The saving clause was the renunciation of the title 'head of the Church' by Queen Elizabeth. And this was due, though Dodwell does not mention the fact, to the persuasion of Thomas Lever, a Puritan. The modified doctrine of the Church is incorporated in Art. XXXVII. On the distinction there recognized between the civil and the sacred functions Dodwell founds his argument for the independence of the clergy. They have an apostolical commission to rule the Church. But over against this stands the fact, that since the Reformation the civil government has ruled the Church for them.

Dodwell consistently condemns the English Reformation.

If the civil power could not deprive a bishop, it followed that the nonjuring bishops were not deprived. It followed also, on Dodwell's principles, that the new bishops who came into their places were schismatics. The Church of England had therefore become schismatical. But here a division arose among the Nonjurors. Archbishop Sancroft made new bishops, who were to continue the holy seed of the true Jacobite to all generations. Dodwell joined the party which opposed the continuation of a nonjuring succession. The new bishops who had taken the sees of the deprived bishops,

The Church of England become schismatical.

* See 'The Doctrine of the Church of England concerning the Independence of the Clergy on the Lay Powers,' sec. iii.

ould cease, he said, to be schismatics as soon as the sees ere ecclesiastically vacant by death or resignation.* They ere not heretics. They had not departed even from the truly Catholic doctrine of passive obedience and non-esistance.' But they were not 'lawful' bishops so long as he deprived bishops claimed the sees. The whole Catholic hurch in heaven and earth is one; and the 'heavenly' or mystical' Bishop has to ratify in heaven whatever is done y any bishop on earth. Whilst, therefore, Sancroft lived ithout resignation and without deprivation by his brother ishops, it was impossible that the heavenly inhabitants ould regard John Tillotson as Archbishop of Canterbury, ratify in heaven the documents signed and sealed at ambeth. Dodwell had yet other arguments. The Non-rors were the 'peculium' of the Church, the salt of the arth in that degenerate age. The Church of England had een given up to Latitudinarians and Puritans. The Non-onformists were conforming occasionally, and who could ell the result if they were suffered to leaven the Church ith their heresies? The infection might spread till in the ational Church Episcopacy itself might not be considered ecessary for the administration of that sacrament on which epended the immortality of the soul.†

History of the Nonjurors

The history of the nonjuring sect after the deprivation of he bishops is soon told. Sancroft delegated his archiepi-copal powers to Lloyd, who, with White and Turner, ad-nitted Hickes and Wagstaffe to the nonjuring episcopate n 1694. Dodwell and his party continued with the Non-rors till the last of the deprived bishops was dead. He

* 'Case in View Considered,' and Case in Fact.'

† Dodwell wrote a preface to a ermon, by Charles Leslie, against arriages in different communions; nd a curious book on the lawfulness f instrumental music in public wor-hip. Macaulay says, 'He published treatise in which he maintained hat a marriage between a member f the Church of England and a Dis-enter was a nullity, and that the ouple so married were, in the sight f heaven, guilty of adultery. He de-ended the use of instrumental music n public worship, on the ground that the notes of the organ had a power to counteract the influence of devils on the spinal marrow of human beings. In his treatise on this subject, he re-marked that there was high authority for the opinion that the spinal mar-row, when decomposed, became a ser-pent. Whether this were or were not correct, he thought it unnecessary to decide. Perhaps, he said, the eminent men in whose works it was found had meant only to express figuratively the great truth that the old serpent operates on us chiefly through the spinal marrow.'—*History of England*, vol. iii. p. 462.

CHAP. VII.

then returned to the Church. After the death of Wagstaffe, Hickes, with the assistance of some Scotch bishops, consecrated Collier and two other new bishops. But the little sect was soon again divided. By some it was thought sinful to pray with the Liturgy of the national Church, in which there were neither prayers for the dead nor any prescription to mix water with the Eucharistic wine. They separated formally in 1718, each party continuing its succession of bishops, and making the 'peculium' an ever-decreasing remnant. Both parties performed their consecrations with the help of Scotch bishops, the Episcopal Church of Scotland being divided into two corresponding parties. The Nonjurors continued to diminish till their final extinction, which can scarcely be dated. The last bishop is said to have died in Ireland in 1805, and a living specimen of the now extinct species, a nonjuring clergyman, was discovered in 1815, somewhere in the west of England.*

The last of the Nonjurors.

Two eminent theological writers, not hitherto mentioned, died in the reign of Charles II. These were Dr. Isaac Barrow and Archbishop Leighton, two men who had but little resemblance to each other and neither of whom can claim any distinguished place for originality in theology. Barrow

Isaac Barrow.

* See Lathbury's Hist. of the Nonjurors.

The most zealous opponent of the Nonjurors seems to have been Humphry Hody. He discovered a MS. of the thirteenth century, called the Baroccian, which contained a treatise on ecclesiastical history. From this he was able to show that the universal custom of the Church had been, that though a bishop were deprived unjustly, that was never made the occasion of a schism. Many bishops had been deprived by emperors, but they always continued in the communion of the Church. 'Solomon and Abiathar' was a popular tract, said to have been written by a Mr. Hill. It was in the form of a dialogue, and both sides were well argued. The Levitical law was supposed to have given all government to the priesthood. But the people wished a king, and then the mitre became subject to the crown. A similar sacerdotal government was said to have existed before the Flood. Christ not only restored, but refined upon this sacerdotal government. He established His hierarchy, not in princes, but in apostles. Solomon did not properly deprive Abiathar of his priestly office, but required him to resign it under the penalty of being put to death. Abiathar was guilty of rebellion, which destroyed, it was supposed, the parallel between him and the nonjuring bishops. The author's judgment seemed to be that in ecclesiastical matters, the State could not govern without the co-operation of the Church. In the 'Unity of the Priesthood,' by Dr. Bisby, it was shown to be 'dissonant to all primitive practice, to the ancient constitutions and canons of the Church,' to have bishops thrust out by civil rulers and new ones put in their places. The ancient cry was 'One God, one Christ, one Bishop.' Now we have more than one in a diocese. The result is schism, and the new bishops are the schismatics.

as educated at Cambridge, in the time of the Common- CHAP. VII.
ealth, but he is altogether free from the Puritan spirit. .e cannot be classed with the Platonists, yet he is too ational for the ordinary type of a High Churchman. He ceived orders from Bishop Brownrig before the Restora- .on, thus espousing the cause of the Episcopal clergy in he hour of their adversity. He was outside of the con- ending parties, in a sense above them, not, however, by ny spirit of mystical philosophy or religious intuition, but ı virtue of a vigorous practical intellect. In 1660 he was ppointed Professor of Greek in the University of Cam- ridge, in 1663 Professor of Mathematics, and in 1673, hen Barrow had scarcely passed the forty-third year of his ge, King Charles did one of those wise things which he is aid never to have done, by appointing him to the master- hip of the great college of Trinity. In doing this the king aid, with as much truth as wisdom, that the new Master of rinity was 'the best scholar in England.' Barrow had arned a great reputation as a mathematician before he en- ered on the study of divinity. To this study he brought a lear intellect, great sincerity, and immense industry. He lid not build on the foundations that had been laid by Cud- vorth and Whichcot. He was more orthodox than they ıad been. Great mathematicians are rarely heretics. They eason indeed, and reasoning usually leads to heresy; but mathematicians generally take dogmas as axioms, and con- ine their reasoning to assumed positions.

Barrow's theological works may be divided into three classes: his 'Exposition of the Creed,' his Sermons, and his 'Treatise of the Pope's Supremacy.' In the first chiefly we find his theology, in the second his gospel, and in the third his Protestantism. On the Creed, Barrow differs from Pearson as to the foundation on which belief rests, and so far also as to the nature of faith. He denies that faith rests on bare authority, or that that only is believing which de- pends on testimony. 'Spirits,' he says, 'are to be tried, and revelations themselves to be examined, before we can upon their word believe any particular doctrine avouched by them.' The trying of spirits and examining of revela- tions implies in man a faculty of judging. Faith then does

On the Creed.

CHAP. VII.

not rest on bare authority. It has a foundation in reaso and so far in knowledge. Barrow expressly produces argu ments to this effect. To prove that God must be veracious because He says so, or that revelation in general must b trusted from particular revelations, he calls *petitiones prin cipii* most inconclusive and ineffectual discourses.* He sup poses that if we could inquire into the faith of the firs Christians, we should find that it rested on reason and no on mere authority. Reason, Barrow says, is the foundatio of faith; yet there are things revealed beyond or out of rea son, to be believed solely on the authority of that revelatio of which we are certified by reason. In this way he is bot rational and orthodox, but on the ground of a distinctio which has been often disputed. In a revelation which is t be judged by reason, everything contained in the revelatio is supposed to be taken into the reckoning.

In his expositions of the doctrines laid down in the Creed there is not much in which Barrow differs from Pearson In opposition to the Calvinists, he makes the atonemen universal; yet he agrees with the most 'Evangelical' or both sides in making it an actual expiation of sin. The wrath of God was appeased by the infinitely precious blood of Christ. God was thereby reconciled to men who were alienated from Him. Barrow is also clearly 'Evangelical' in his views of justification, distinguishing it as a legal act distinct from actual holiness or sanctification, which is a subsequent work. In church polity he agrees with Hooker and the great body of the divines of the Church of England, in holding that no special form of government is laid down in the Scriptures. Concerning the Sacraments he says, 'It is a peculiar excellency of our religion that it doth not much employ men's care, pains, and time about matters of cere monial observance, but doth chiefly, and in a manner wholly, exercise them in works of substantial duty agreeable to reason, perfective of man's nature, productive of true glory to God and solid benefit to man.'†

His theology.

On the Sacraments.

He recognizes, however, in the two sacraments of the

* 'Exposition of the Creed,' p. 16; ed. 1697.

† See 'The Doctrine of the Sacraments,' appended to the 'Exposition of the Creed.'

el means for the effectual infusion of grace in those receive them rightly. By baptism we are admitted into nant with God, made new creatures, have the remission ns, with the seal and assurance of eternal life. The aarist is a commemorative representation of Christ's ion. In it the benefits of that passion are conveyed to thy receivers. It declares the mystical union of Christ the believer, and it seals that union which exists among His true disciples.

he general tone of Barrow's sermons has never found h favour among religious people. They want the mys- l element, which has always a charm for piety. They t also the fervour, or what some people would call, the ction' of Puritanism; and they say too little about the rch and the sacraments to be much esteemed by High rchmen. They are orthodox in doctrine, but ethical cold, reasoning sometimes from the pleasures of religion, at other times appealing to present or future interest. great argument for the truth of Christianity is, that the al life which it prescribes is agreeable to reason. How

His sermons ethical.

:h this really proved, and how it affected the meaning of istianity, was more fully discussed in the beginning of following century. The wonder is that, being so ortho-, Barrow went so far with reason; or that, having gone so he did not go further. In a sermon on 'The Pleasant- s of Religion,' he identifies religion with wisdom. It is, says, a revelation of truth, pleasant and peaceable, and eing us from 'the inconveniences, the mischiefs, and the elicities to which we are subject.' This is doubtless true wisdom, and in a sense true also of religion. But it is a gue and poor gospel to those who believe Christianity as rrow professed to believe it, and to those who do not ieve Christianity it is a mere truism concerning wisdom, t of no meaning when spoken of religion. Wisdom, it is d, confers the advantages which belong to clear under- nding, deliberate advice, and sagacious foresight. Solo- n, in the words of the text, had said that wisdom's ways ways of pleasantness, and that all her paths are peace. l philosophy and all teachers of morality have said the me; and so far as Christianity agrees in this teaching so

CHAP. VII.

far it is rational and good. But is this the chief part c Christianity? In Barrow's theology it could not be, yet i the general tone and tenour of his sermons it is. He reckon of little value 'a nice orthodoxy,' and he condemns 'a politi subjection of our judgment to the peremptory dictates o men.' He commends 'a sincere love of truth,' and the re ception of 'doctrines fundamentally good,' acknowledgin that there are things necessary to be believed, yet makin the test of good the practical issue of mending our ways The mere titles of many of Barrow's sermons, as th 'Pleasantness of Religion,' the 'Profitableness of Religion, and 'Upright Walking Sure Walking,' indicate clearly tha the ethical side of Christianity was the one which he favoure

Makes religion appeal to the interests of men.

most. He addressed his arguments to the interests of men both in this life and the future. He set no value on th mere performances of duties from fear of punishment o hope of temporal reward; yet he urged motives for becom ing religious from consideration of rewards and punishment in the life to come. The mere possibility of eternal punish ment is thought to be a motive sufficient to affect 'rationa and prudent' men. But the main argument ever is the de lights of religion. It is true that the wicked often prosper Persons void of piety say that it is vain to serve God; and even pious men, when their spirits are dejected, often ask, 'What profit shall we have if we pray unto Him?' The profit of religion is explained as consisting of hope and con tentment. Piety frees a man's life from disorder and de struction. It prescribes medicine for the soul as physician do for the body. Barrow, however, felt that his argument was not complete. The unrighteous have often prosperity while the godly are in adversity. There is always 'some *dead fly* in our box,' and, therefore, we must 'not seek our content here, but in another world.' The poor but pious man cannot be wretched, and the reason is that he 'hath interest in goods incomparably most precious.'

On the Pope's supremacy.

The 'Treatise on the Pope's Supremacy' contains nothing new or original. It takes the form of a refutation of a number of 'suppositions' on which this supremacy is erected. It is a claim made by the Church of Rome, but the title of the claim is uncertain. The Roman doctors have never

greed about the extent of the authority due to the Pope, which is 'a shrewd prejudice against it, as if a man had a piece of land and nobody could tell where it lies, or how it was consigned to him.' We naturally suspect such a title. If God, Barrow says, had instituted such an office as that claimed by the Pope, we should have known something satisfactory about its nature and use. The Pope has never been able to define his own authority, which must be an argument for his incapacity to determine questions of faith. Barrow speaks of the claims which the Popes have made to temporal dominion over kings and kingdoms, quoting the Bulls of Pope Sixtus against Henry of Navarre, and of Paul V. against Queen Elizabeth. He traces the growth of these claims from their first beginning, till they culminated in Gregory VII. He then argues that if the Popes have erred in this, it is no trifling error. Yet a great portion of the Roman Catholic world do not admit these claims to temporal authority, and those who refuse to admit them are described by Bellarmine and Baronius as 'a sort of heretics skulking in the bosom of the Church.' But the Church of Rome is not even agreed as to the Pope's spiritual authority. Some decrees, to use Bellarmine's words, do not allow the Pope any other supremacy than that which the Duke of Venice has in his Synod, or the General of an Order in his congregation. Barrow concludes that if the Church of Rome has really any doctrine on the subject, it must be that the Pope's sovereignty is absolute.

CHAP. VII.

The following 'suppositions' are refuted in detail:—1. 'That St. Peter had primacy over the Apostles.' Barrow admits that St. Peter had a primacy of 'worthy reputation, probably seniority, and some other things.' But it is denied that he had a primacy of authority. 2. 'That St. Peter's primacy, with its rights and prerogatives, was not personal, but derivable to his successors.' Barrow maintains that this primacy, whatever it consisted in, was personal. All bishops, according to St. Cyprian, were successors of St. Peter. None of the Fathers have ever spoken of such a succession as the Roman doctors claim. 3. 'That St. Peter was Bishop of Rome.' Barrow says, that with good reason this may be denied, and it cannot be answered. An apostle is above a

St. Peter's supposed primacy.

CHAP. VII.

bishop, as a king is above a lord mayor. It would ha been a degradation for him to have become bishop of a see; for, being an apostle, he could exercise episcopal fun tions wherever he went. In the epistles said to have bee written from Rome, Peter does not call himself the bisho The Fathers say that he was Bishop of Antioch, and the censure all bishops who leave one see for another. 4. 'Th St. Peter did continue Bishop of Rome after his translatio and was so at his decease.' Barrow quotes ecclesiastic writers who say that St. Peter appointed bishops of Rom which he could not have done had he been Bishop of Rom himself. This would have been contrary to the ancient rite of discipline. The most ancient writers do not call Pete Bishop of Rome. They only say that he was one of th founders of the Church of Rome. 5. 'That the bishops o Rome, according to God's institution, and by original righ derived thence, should have universal supremacy and juris diction, containing the privileges and prerogatives formerly described, over the Christian Church.' This 'supposition is founded on those which precede it, which being uncer tain or false, this must be so too. The link is wanting whicl should connect what belonged to St. Peter with the Roman See. The universal jurisdiction may have gone into another channel. There were other churches founded by apostles, as those of Jerusalem and Antioch. The plea is that St. Peter, by *will*, made over his jurisdiction to Rome. Barrow asks where his *will* is. St. Peter died intestate. 'There is,' Barrow says, 'a strange enchantment in words. This claim to be Catholic has always been a strong argument with weak people. Divers prevalent factions did assume to themselves the name Catholic, and the Roman Church particularly hath appropriated that word to itself, even so as to commit a bull implying Rome and the universe to be the same place, and this perpetual canting of the term hath been a most effective charm to weak people, *I am a Catholic*, that is, *an Universal, and thus far all I hold is true*.' This is the great argument. 6. 'That in fact the Roman bishops from St. Peter's time, have enjoyed and exercised the sovereign power.' Barrow points to the fact attested by all ecclesiastical historians, that the bishops of Rome never exercised this power.

St. Peter left no will.

ynods and Councils were never convoked by Popes, but ways by princes or emperors. The Popes now pretend iat a synod can decide nothing without their authority. ut this is not said in the divine law, in any old canon, nor it found in primitive custom. 7. 'That the Papal supreiacy is indefectible and unalterable.' Barrow does not nd that this is promised in Scripture. A supremacy iven to the Popes might have been conditional and ubject to change. Civil government, which is 'from od,' and 'ordained of God,' is liable to various alteraons, and it is reasonable that the Church, in its external orm and political administration, should be suited to he state of the world and the constitution of worldly overnment.

Archbishop Leighton.

Robert Leighton was the son of Alexander Leighton, the iolent Presbyterian, who was severely punished by the ligh Commission, for writing 'Zion's Plea against Preacy.' The son was altogether unlike his father. He never ntered into the spirit of any party, nor did he reckon ecclesiastical government a matter of sufficient importance to be iade the cause of a division in the Church. In 1641, at he age of thirty, he was ordained minister of Newbattle, n Mid Lothian. He took the Covenant, but opposed its nforcement on others against their conscience. His piety t least is discernible in the answer which he made to the resbytery, when they rebuked him for not preaching up to he times. 'If,' he said, 'you all preach up to the times, ou might surely allow one poor brother to preach Christ nd eternity.' After ministering for eleven years in Newattle, he resigned his charge, and was soon after appointed Principal of the University of Edinburgh. About the time of the Restoration, he was made Bishop of Dunblane, an office which he accepted reluctantly, and which he resigned at the end of three years. He was afterwards induced to take the Archbishopric of Glasgow, which he did only on condition that under a scheme of modified Episcopacy, he might include the Presbyterians who had not yet conformed. He had but little encouragement from the Government and the other bishops. He failed to make peace, and at his own earnest request was again permitted to resign his office.

CHAP. VII.

A Calvinist.

There is nothing in Leighton's theology to distinguis him from an ordinary divine of the school of Calvin. H speaks of the 'decrees' with awful reverence. He adduce in support of believing them, the usual arguments from th divine foreknowledge, from providence and necessity, eve charitably interpreting the fate of the Pagans as equivalen to Christian predestination. The 'decrees' are to be be lieved, but we are not to reason about them, nor indeed t think about them more than we are obliged. All Calvinist have been anxious to fix narrow limits to the reason of ma in the sphere of religion. We cannot, they say, know Go as just and good. We can only cry out, 'O the depth! The theology of Calvin underlies all Leighton's sermons It rarely however appears in the form of dogmas. Hi. mind turns instinctively to practical piety. He is decided in his opposition to the peculiar doctrines of the Church o: Rome, yet his favourite authors are St. Bernard, St. Thomas à Kempis, St. Francis de Sales, and the Port Royalists His views of the sacraments are in no way different from the ordinary stereotyped views of the Presbyterians o Scotland. There is nothing to determine clearly that he really differed from what is generally supposed to be the doctrine of Zwingle. He speaks of 'illumination' being ascribed to baptism, because this illumination is the full purification of the soul; but he does not seem ever to call baptism even by the ordinary name of regeneration. In an exposition of the Creed, the Catholic Church is defined as the whole body of the elect, while 'elect' is explained in the sense of Calvin, as the Church universal and invisible, the finally saved.

Though Leighton did not progress beyond the theology of Calvin, it is yet evident that he did not go back to any of the superstitions which that theology had rejected. In other respects, he was in advance of his contemporaries. There is no Scotch theologian of that age that can for a moment stand beside Leighton. He condemned the whole system of oaths, impositions and covenants. He advocated in the Scotch Parliament that the Covenanters should be allowed to take the oath of supremacy to Charles II., with the qualifications suggested by their leader, the Earl of

Opposed to oaths and impositions.

'assilis. When the other bishops pleaded the hard measures of the Covenanters against those who refused the Covenant, Leighton answered that gentleness would be a better revenge then severity. His countrymen have naturally blamed him for taking the side of Episcopacy at all. But he certainly expected by so doing to secure the peace nd unity of the Church. He failed, and yet his failure is either to be attributed to want of foresight, nor to mere belief in the improbable. Two-thirds of the ministers of he Kirk had already conformed to Episcopacy, and there were reasonable hopes that with indulgent treatment the other third would in time have followed. But the Church of England was governed by violent men. They were determined to convert Scotland in the same lofty spirit in which they had triumphed over the Puritans at the Savoy Conference. The policy of the prelates, bad in England, was elf-destructive in Scotland. CHAP. VII.

Leighton has been blamed for submitting to ordination as deacon and presbyter, before he was consecrated a bishop. The Bishop of London told him that this was necessary, as the Church of Scotland, being in schism, could not give orders. Leighton did not admit the argument, but he submitted to re-ordination on what must at least be admitted a rational principle, that he was simply conforming to the rules of the Church established by law. James Sharp, who was consecrated at the same time, was greatly opposed o this re-ordination, and could not be satisfied with the easons which satisfied Leighton. Both, however, submitted. The consecrating bishops meant one thing, and the consecrated another. A sad history followed. After the Revolution the bishops were expelled and Presbyterianism established. The battle ended in a permanent separation of the two Churches. Such were the results of the policy of Gilbert Sheldon.* † And to re-ordination.

* 'This was the incendiary! This Sheldon, the most virulent enemy and poisoner of the English Church. Alas! she still feels the *taint* in her very bones. I look on Gardiner as canonizable compared with Sheldon.'—*S. T. Coleridge*, '*Notes on English Divines*,' vol. ii. p. 22.

† An edition of Leighton's Works has recently been published by the Rev. William West, Incumbent of St. Columba's, Nairn. Mr. West has spent many years in his work, and seems to have done it carefully and in a liberal spirit. It is only in this spirit that Leighton can be treated.

CHAPTER VIII.

ARCHBISHOPS AND BISHOPS IN THE TIME OF WILLIAM AND MARY —TILLOTSON'S SERMONS.—SHARP'S SERMONS.—KIDDER'S 'DEMONSTRATION OF THE MESSIAS.'—BISHOP PATRICK.—BISHOP FOWLER.—BISHOP STILLINGFLEET.—ARCHBISHOP TENISON.—BISHOP BURNET.—BISHOP MOORE.—BISHOP GROVE.—BISHOP WILLIAMS' BOYLE LECTURES.—DR. JOHN SCOTT ON 'THE CHRISTIAN LIFE.'—DR. WHITBY ON THE EVIDENCES, ORIGINAL SIN, AND THE USE OF REASON.—DR. WILLIAM OUTRAM ON SATISFACTION.—JOSEPH GLANVILL.—BISHOP SPRAT'S 'HISTORY OF THE ROYAL SOCIETY.'—THEOLOGICAL WRITINGS OF THE HON. ROBERT BOYLE, JOHN LOCKE, AND SIR ISAAC NEWTON.

The Church of England renounces the divine right of kings.

THE accession of William and Mary marks the beginning of a new era in the history of the Church of England. As the great body of the clergy took the oaths, the divine right of kings was openly renounced. The doctrine as held by the Nonjurors had refuted itself, and by the same arguments as the divine right of the Pope had come to an end at the Reformation. The Church had outlived the king-worship of the Stuart bishops. Hitherto it had been impossible for the clergy to separate the cause of the Church of England from that of the King, but now the separation is made for them. The connection of the Church with the hereditary monarch had grown naturally out of the circumstances of the Reformation. The Reformers looked to the King as their protector from the usurpations of the Bishop of Rome. He was to them the symbol or representative of the life of the nation. To confound the symbol with that which is symbolized is a common error. The clergy

ad done this till the great teacher, experience, taught iem that it was the nation, and not the King, that was ally divine. The Nonjurors remained ignorant, in spite f this teacher, and in due time met their inevitable fate.

It was not long before the leaders of the London clergy ere made bishops. Tillotson was preferred to Canterbury, harp to York, Kidder to Bath and Wells, Patrick to Chihester, Fowler to Gloucester, Stillingfleet to Worcester, enison to Lincoln, and Burnet to Salisbury.* It is not often iat an archbishop is a leader in anything, except by virtue his office. But John Tillotson was the prince of preachers, great master of the English language, as well as the wisest id best man that ever sat in the primatial chair of Canterbury. or the first time since the Reformation the voice of reason as now clearly heard in the high places of the Church. llotson was the product of the best influences that ere at work in his day; the son of Puritan parents honest and upright life, he might have said with hleiermacher that piety was the maternal bosom on nich he had been nursed. In 1647, he entered Cambridge, entire sympathy with everything that was Puritan. He ard four sermons every Sunday, and during the week studied Supralapsarian Theology, as expounded by Dr. illiam Twisse. Before he left Cambridge, he had read hillingworth. This prepared him to enter into the spirit the Platonists, who had just arisen at Cambridge. He moved to London, where he had the acquaintance of shop Brownrig, Dr. Hacket, and other judicious men on Episcopal side. He received orders from the Bishop of lloway, but continued to identify himself with the Presterians till the Act of Uniformity. He passed rapidly rough several preferments, till he was made Dean of Can-

Archbishop Tillotson.

* Cumberland was promoted to Peborough, and Stafford to Chester. those who were bishops under James the best known are Compton of London, Trelawney of Bristol, Mew of Winchester, Croft of Hereford, Barlow of Lincoln, Ward of Salisbury, Lloyd of St. Asaph, and at of Rochester. The rest are nown, or not known for any good, Watson, of St. David's, was afterwards deprived for simony. Wood, of Lichfield, obtained his bishopric through the Duchess of Cleveland. Hall, an obscure clergyman, was promoted to Oxford by James, for reading the Declaration of Indulgence; and Crew, of Durham, obtained that rich bishopric by a large bribe to one of the mistresses of James II.

CHAP. VIII.

terbury, afterwards of St. Paul's, and finally, by command the King, he accepted the primacy.

Importance of an acquaintance with Tillotson's theology.

An acquaintance with Tillotson's theology is necessary a right understanding of the great controversies of this a the following age. It is difficult to believe that his sermo were written by one who lived and died in the cou of the seventeenth century. The spirit of that century everything but its intense earnestness has disappear Miracles such as those recorded by Richard Baxter a Henry More have ceased to be performed. The sacramen have lost their power of incantation. They are no long channels of supernatural grace, and the witches are dead. Tillotson, indeed, defends the words of the Ba tismal Service, but he explains them as signifying simp that the baptized enter into a covenant, by which 'they a put into a state of capacity of all the blessings of the Go pel.'* The doctrines of Calvin disappear at the same tim They were protected by the same veil which made a my tery of the sacraments and which forbade the exercise reason. They are opposed to that of which we are mo certain—our sense of right and wrong. They are subversi of the very faculty by which we know that there is a Go and by which we have an assurance that God has reveal Himself to us. Concerning the 'eternal decree,' Tillots says, 'I am as certain that this doctrine cannot be of G as I am sure that God is good and just, because this grat upon the notion that mankind have of goodness and justic This is that which no good man would do, and therefore cannot be believed of infinite goodness. If an Apostle, an angel from heaven, teach any doctrine which plain overthrows the goodness and justice of God, let him accursed. For every man hath greater assurance that G is good and just than he can have of any subtle speculatio about predestination and the decrees of God.'†

Decline of sacerdotalism, witchcraft, and Calvinism.

Tillotson's theology, if we except his rejection of Ca vin's decrees and the sacramental superstitions, was for tl most part what would be reckoned orthodox. His explan tions of grace were Arminian. He denied it to be irresistible, and he insisted on the necessity of good works.

* Vol. x. p. 358. Ralph Barker's edition. † Vol. vi. p. 46.

ıe faith by which a man is saved he always explained as ıplying obedience. He doubted the validity of a death-ɔd repentance, because there was no evidence of works, ɔr any test of sincerity which would be a pledge of its ɔoducing good works. This led to the identification of .stification with sanctification. 'According to the terms ' the Gospel,' he says, 'the great condition of our justifi-ıtion and acceptance with God is the real renovation of our ɛarts and lives.'* This, doubtless, differs widely from at doctrine which represents the elect as righteous be-.use Christ is righteous. Yet Tillotson lays great import-ıce on the doctrine of substitution. He uses the strongest ɔssible language on this subject, and takes literally all the ıcrificial passages and allusions in the Holy Scriptures. hrist, he says, died to deliver us from wrath. By His death od was reconciled to us.† He made satisfaction to Divine .stice. He paid the price of redemption. If He had not ied we had perished eternally.‡ The satisfaction was of finite value, because the sufferings were those of an infi-te Person. It was equal to the offences which were gainst an infinite God.§ After quoting several pages of .crificial passages from the New Testament, Tillotson says ıat it was impossible for God to have used words more ain or more express to declare this doctrine. The Soci-ıans can only explain them by evasions that would over-ırow every principle of religion taught in the Scriptures. ı another place, however,‖ he explains the satisfaction of hrist in a way that evidently abates from the idea of a teral price. 'God,' he says, 'was not angry with His Son, ɔr He was always well pleased with Him.' It is added, ıat Christ did not suffer the same which the sinner would ıve suffered,—that is, 'the proper pains and torments of ıe damned.' His perfect obedience and voluntary sacrifice our stead were acceptable to His Father, and on account f them the Father entered into a covenant of grace and ıercy with mankind. The argument is repeated in many laces, that it was impossible for God to forgive without His

Tillotson on the atonement.

* Vol. iv. p. 248.
† Vol. xii. p. 278.
‡ Vol. v. p. 214.
§ Vol. vi. p. 286.
‖ Vol. v. p. 214.

CHAP. VIII.

justice being satisfied. To have done this would have been to make light of sin. It was necessary that the Divine hatred of sin should be manifest before the universe. The Cross of Christ tells us what a terrible thing it is. It was sin which crucified the Son of God. But by His death eternal justice is vindicated, and now we may crucify sin.

Though Tillotson is orthodox on the atonement, he rarely makes it the subject of his sermons. Even then he does not so much preach it, as preach about it. The Puritans said that he did not preach Christ.* He answered that he preached what Christ preached. He taught the necessity and the blessedness of being righteous. He took his stand on the moral constitution of man. We have indestructible notions of good and evil, virtue and vice. Experience proves to us that well-doing is our interest, and wrong-doing our ruin. The sense of right is clearly declared by Tillotson to be an inward intuition, and yet he does not say that virtue should be followed for its own sake. On this subject there is the same confusion which we have seen in Barrow. Two elements had been contributed from two different sources. The Scriptures had spoken in popular language of rewards and punishments. Reason and experience had added their testimony that the rewards and punishments are inseparably connected with virtue and vice. Tillotson believed the testimonies both of Scripture and experience, but without being able to effect a reconciliation between the elements which each contributed. The visible rewards of virtue were not thought sufficient to make men virtuous, and therefore heaven was added as something in reversion. Without the hope of such a reward in another life, Tillotson says expressly that human nature, as it is now constituted, is incapable of following virtue for its own sake. He grants that there is a satisfaction and a delight in being righteous, and yet he says that their foundation is in the hope of a reward to come. Without this reward virtue would be a deceiver. This is illustrated by the case of the first Christians, of whom St. Paul says, that if in this life only they had hope, they were

On the moral constitution of man.

* When he left Keddington, in Suffolk, the people universally complained that Jesus Christ had not been preached among them since Tillotson had been settled in the parish. —*Birch's Life of Tillotson*, p. 28.

f all men most miserable. In one sermon* he tells a story f a woman who went about with a pitcher in one hand and pan of coals in the other, and being asked what she meant o do with them, she answered 'With the one to burn eaven, and with the other to quench hell, that men might ove God and virtue for their own sakes, without hope of eward or fear of punishment.' This woman, he says, may ave been devout, but he does not think that she was ver-wise. Without rewards and punishments, virtue would e a dry speculation, and men would give up the pursuit of eligion.

Tillotson was no mystic. In this he had departed from he Platonists as well as from the Puritans. He ridiculed ll discourses about 'super-essential life,' self-annihilation, r the union of 'the nothing with the nothing.' He could nly see man as a being influenced by motives which affected is interests. The most frequent subjects of his sermons re those which promise man some gain. Virtue being conucive to health, and to peace of mind, we should be virious. God having promised heaven to the devout, we hall have profit if we pray to Him. In preaching virtue, illotson performs the function of a moral philosopher. On his subject he repeats all that was said by Plato, and he nticipates much that was written on it in the following cenury. This appeal to interest is carried into religion, hich is scarcely separated from the performance of moral uties. Tillotson is careful to show the worthlessness of ll religious acts which are independent of doing justly and oving mercy. The observance of moral duties religiously, hat is with reference to God and a future life, seems to be egarded as the chief part of religion. It is God who is unelfish. He gives laws to men for their benefit, not for His wn. The religious man is a wise or prudent man, because e has laid up treasure for the time to come. The fear of uture punishment is supposed to be a powerful motive in leterring men from sin. It is described as an argument hich 'takes the fastest and surest hold upon human nature, nd will many times move and affect, when no other conideratione will work upon us.'† When the love of God

On the influence of rewards and punishments.

* Vol. ix. p. 49. † Vol. xi. p. 124.

CHAP. VIII.

and goodness fails, men will be frightened by the fear of hell and the awe of a judgment to come. The thought of eternal ages in misery is reckoned sufficient to induce men to forego all present pleasures, and to endure all present sufferings that they may escape the suffering which is eternal. Even the barest probability that such a thing may be, is said to be a sufficient reason for our striving to flee from it.

Appeals to self-interest.

It might have been supposed, that though Tillotson said so much of the rewards of virtue, he really meant after all only the natural rewards which must follow men into the future life. But his appeals to self-interest, and his earnest counsels to act on probability forbid this supposition. We are to be virtuous and good, not because we feel that virtue and goodness are eternal if anything be eternal, but because perhaps heaven is suspended on them. Religion is to become as it were a game of chance. One argument urged against Atheism is that it is 'unsafe.'* The Atheist says that there is no God, and so he loses all; but the believer wisely secures 'the main chance.' In another sermon,† Tillotson uses the same arguments and remonstrates with men for not preparing for the life to come, when they have more certainty of it than of many things for which they risk much in this life. When men are sick they take physic on probability, trusting to the skill of physicians. Merchants venture their ships laden with treasures to places which they have never seen. In the business of the world no labours are reckoned too great where there are probabilities of gain. Tillotson seems to have been unconscious of the difference between the natural results of well-doing and an everlasting kingdom which depended on a probability. In religion, the poorest of all motives is that of keeping to the 'safe side.' Its very essence is a boundless trust, forgetful of self and sure only of the triumph of righteousness.‡

The old theology struggles with the new.

In Tillotson's mind the old leaven was still struggling with the new. But this was only one phase of a conflict of principles not yet reconciled. Revelation had been received

* Vol. i. p. 51, ed. 1741; the edition which consists of the sermons published in Tillotson's lifetime.

† Vol. i. p. 324.

‡ We are not to forget that we derive our knowledge of Tillotson's theology chiefly from posthumous sermons which were preached at different periods of his life. Had he revised them for publication, it is possible that the discordant elements would have been reduced to harmony.

something distinct from what was called natural religion. Tillotson still received 'revelation' in the old sense, but he received natural religion too. Revelation was a kind of republication of natural religion. In fact it was natural religion enforced by rewards. It made the doctrines concerning God more certain,* and it promised assistance in performing good works. But as the natural notions were certain, and as nothing could be received as revelation which contradicted them, it is evident that the old view of revelation was in danger of a change. This subject had been already discussed by Lord Herbert, whose main principles were now adopted by all rational theologians, to whom they did not appear as subversive of Christianity, but rather, as Richard Baxter said, of singular use in establishing it. Lord Herbert never rejected the Christian revelation. He only said that we are more sure of that which we know by our internal sense than of that which comes to us on the testimony of another. Tillotson's principle is really the same; but instead of dwelling, as Herbert had done, on the clearness and certainty which the Pagans had of religious and moral duties, he dwells rather on the greater light of Christianity. Natural religion is admitted to be a revelation as well as Christianity, and both to be grounded on reason. This was illustrated by the case of Abraham being asked to sacrifice his son. Here an outward revelation commanded him to do what was forbidden by the revelation within. Tillotson's explanation of this case is, that Abraham must have been as certain that this was a revelation from God, as he was of the testimony of his conscience that he ought not to slay his son. In other words the revelation was direct. Abraham's faith, therefore, was not credulity. 'He reasoned with himself.' And the subject of his reasoning was the omnipotence of God. He who had been able to give him a son in his old age, was also able to raise that son from the dead. He was not required to believe something impossible, but only something not probable. And his faith had value only because 'he reasoned' before he came to a decision. Unbelief, it is said, is never condemned in the Scripture, but where sufficient reason has been given for belief. Our

* Vol. v. pp. 53 and 54.

CHAP. VIII.

reason may be imperfect, but 'we must make use of it as it is, and make the best of it.' *†

Reason and faith.

This view of faith, which was necessarily connected with Tillotson's view of revelation, led him to depart from the scholastic definition retained by Bishop Pearson, that it is the belief of something on the word of another. 'The Scripture,' he says, 'useth the word faith more largely for a real persuasion of anything, whether grounded upon sense or reason, or divine revelation.'‡ According to this definition a heathen may have faith. The first act of faith must from its nature be independent of revelation. Before we can believe in revelation we must believe in God. He that cometh to God must believe that He is. Faith implies conviction, and that can only be based on rational evidence. Some men may believe right without inquiry, but such men are right only by accident. They might have been wrong for all that was due to them. Men may sin by credulity as well as by unbelief. The prophet in the Book of Kings, who was commanded by God not to eat or drink at Bethel, was torn to pieces by a lion, because he believed the pretended revelation of another prophet. The merit of faith clearly becomes, on Tillotson's principles, the merit of sincere and honest examination. Progress in religious knowledge keeps pace with progress in goodness. Earnest striving after the realization of what we know to be good is the real walk of faith. Whoever is found in this path is led by the Spirit of God into all necessary truth. He has an inward conviction, which is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen.

The discussion of faith involved that of the evidence of Christianity. Tillotson did not enter on this subject as against the Deists. He was pressed to it by the Roman Catholics. They boasted an absolute certainty in the infallible Church, and demanded of him how he knew that Christianity was not a cunningly devised fable. His de-

* Vol. i. p. 68.

† 'That men should not take the liberty to examine their religion and to inquire into the grounds and reasons of it—this, I think, is so far from being forbidden, that a free and impartial inquiry into the grounds and reasons of our religion, and a thorough trial and examination of them, is one of the best means to confirm and establish us in the profession of it.'—Vol. i. p. 116.

‡ Vol. iv. p. 308.

ences of Christianity may not be invulnerable, but he had made great progress since Richard Baxter discussed the same subject against 'the generation of seekers.' Tillotson is faithful to his master, Chillingworth. He calmly and freely admits that the evidence for the Christian revelation does not amount to absolute certainty.* He refuses to invent ways for God. We may have what is called 'an undoubted' certainty; that is, we may be morally certain, and with the kind of certainty which it has pleased God to give us our wisdom is to be content. It is the pretence to absolute certainty which is the cause of unbelief. 'If,' Tillotson says, 'men would be contented to speak justly of things, and pretend to no greater assurance than they can bring evidence for, considerate men would be more apt to believe them.'†

Moral certainty of the truth of Christianity.

The main argument is from miracles. The doctrine of course must not contradict natural notions. It must be credible and possible. The authority both of Moses and Jesus is resolved into miracles. Many passages are quoted from the Scriptures to show that the whole weight of the authority, both of the law and the gospel, is laid on miracles. The chief of these is the resurrection of Jesus. The Jews saw the miracles of the gospel. They had the evidence of their senses, and therefore they were inexcusable. We have the credible report of eye-witnesses, which ought to be sufficient for our belief. This is said to have been the judgment of St. John, who says, 'These things were written that ye might believe.' These miracles being wrought in confirmation of the Christian doctrine, it must be divine. But the part of the argument which needs defence is the credibility of the report. Tillotson was not prepared for Hume's famous objection, that the report or testimony was more likely to be false than the miracles true.

Argument from miracles.

* 'Here it will be proper to inquire what is the highest degree of assurance which we can have concerning a Divine revelation made to another, that it is such, whether it be an infallible assurance or only an undoubted certainty? The difference between them is this; an infallible assurance as such excludes all possibility of error and mistake; an undoubted certainty doth not exclude all possibility of mistake, but only all just and reasonable cause why a prudent and considerate man should doubt. And the reason why I make this inquiry, is in order to be satisfied of a clear and firm way for the resolution of our faith against the Papists, who say it is impossible for us to give any satisfactory account of our faith, because we do finally resolve it into fallible grounds.'—Vol. xii. p. 106.

† Vol. xii. p. 116.

CHAP. VIII.

It is altogether out of his reckoning. He does not know with certainty that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, or St. Matthew the gospel that bears his name, but he has a credible and uncontradicted tradition that they were the authors. There is no reason, he says, for doubting that they were, and therefore no necessity for proving it. To believe that St. Matthew wrote a history of the gospel is not necessary to salvation. It is only necessary to believe what he wrote.* That the authors of the books of the Bible were inspired is proved by the miracles, which were testimonies from heaven that they were divine persons. Most of the writers of the New Testament were Apostles, and therefore endued with miraculous power. But even 'if some of them were not inspired,' Tillotson says that it is of no dangerous consequence,'† so long as their writings contain nothing contrary to those which are unquestionably inspired.‡ For the Canon of Scripture no

Inspiration.

* Vol. xii. p. 100.

† Vol. xii. p. 101.

‡ On inspiration Tillotson says, 'If any one inquire further, how far the penmen of Scripture were inspired in the writing of these books, whether only so far as to be secured from mistake in the delivery of any message or doctrine from God, or in the relation of any history or matter of fact, yet so as they were left every man to his own style and manner of expression, or that everything they wrote was immediately dictated to them, and that not only the sense of it, but the very words and phrases by which they express things, and that they are merely instruments or penmen, I shall not take upon me to determine. I shall only say this in general, that considering the end of this inspiration, which was to inform the world certainly of the mind and will of God, it is necessary for every man to believe that the inspired penmen of Scripture were so far assisted as was necessary to this end, and he that thinks upon good grounds that this end cannot be secured unless every word and syllable were immediately dictated, he hath reason to believe it was so; but if any man upon good grounds thinks the end of writing the Scripture may be sufficiently secured without that, he hath no reason to conclude that God, who is not wanting in what is necessary, is guilty of doing what is superfluous. And if any man is of opinion that Moses might write the history of those actions which he himself did, or was present at, without an immediate revelation of them, or that Solomon by his natural and acquired wisdom might speak those wise sayings which are in his Proverbs, or the Evangelists might write what they heard and saw, or what they had good assurance of from others, as St. Luke tells us he did: or that St. Paul might write for his cloak and parchments at Troas, and salute by name his friends and brethren, or that he might advise Timothy to drink a little wine, etc., without the immediate dictate of the Spirit of God, he seems to have reason on his side. * * * The Evangelists in relating the discourses of Christ, are very far from agreeing in the particular expressions and words, though they do agree in the substance of the discourses; but if the words had been dictated by the Spirit of God, they must have agreed in them. For when St. Luke differs from St. Matthew, in relating what our Saviour said it is impossible that they should both relate it right as to His very words and forms of expression, but they both relate the substance of what He said. And if it had been of concernment, that everything that they wrote

vidence is adduced but the authority of the Jewish Church or the Old Testament, and the tradition of the Christian Church for the New. A miracle is defined as a substantial work, 'such an effect, as exceeds any natural power that we know of to produce it.* It must also be evident to sense. This condition excludes transubstantiation from the category of miracles. It is admitted that the devil or his instruments may work real miracles, but their miracles are not equal to those wrought in the confirmation of truth. The magicians of Pharaoh could not work such miracles as were performed by Moses and Aaron. God has often permitted miracles to be wrought to countenance error. False Christs were to come. The man of sin was to come with 'power and signs.' But Tillotson says that there are always marks by which the miracles of false teachers may be known. Either their doctrine is such as no miracle can confirm, or it is contrary to what has been already confirmed, or the workers of the miracles are confuted on the spot, like Pharaoh's magicians, Simon Magus, and Elymas the sorcerer. Miracles are made the main evidence of Christianity. Yet Tillotson adds that it does not rest on one argument alone. Perhaps no single argument would be sufficient. 'The full demonstration rests on the union of them all when put together.'

The veracity of God the foundation of faith.

The principle assumed as the foundation of all this reasoning is the veracity of God. He is a God of truth. He does not deceive us. Could we believe it possible for Him to deceive us, we might doubt of everything, even of those things which seem most certain. To suppose that God is the author of errors and delusions would be to deny His existence. Our faculties, our natural notions, our reasonings must be worthy of trust, and these lead to a conviction or moral certainty of the truth of the great principles of natural and revealed religion. It could not be denied that, on Tillotson's principles, natural religion must have a greater certainty than revealed. Yet he often reasons as

should be dictated *ad apicem*, to a tittle, by the Spirit of God, it is of the same concernment still, that the Providence of God should have secured the Scriptures since, to a tittle from the least alteration.' (Vol. xii. pp. 102–34.)

* Vol. xii. p. 315.

CHAP. VIII.

if the contrary were true. He speaks of the Christian revelation as 'clear and undoubted.' He contrasts the certainty it gives over that which was possessed by the wisest of the Pagans. But this clearness and this certainty have their foundation in natural religion, and yet are regarded as additions to it. They are condemned who undermine the certainty of natural religion to make way for revealed, and it is denied that any revealed religion can overthrow natural. Consistently with this, Tillotson continually asserts the greater obligation of natural precepts over any institutions of positive or instituted religions.* Mercy is preferred to sacrifice, and a new creature to either circumcision or uncircumcision. Keeping the commandments of God is reckoned of more importance than any doctrines, even than those taught by apostles and prophets, much more than those which are merely the opinions of men. 'I do not,' he says, 'intend to plead for any error, but I would not have Christianity chiefly measured by matters of opinion. I know no such error and heresy as a wicked life. That man believes the gospel best who lives most according to it. Though no man can have a worse opinion of the Socinian doctrine than I have, yet I had rather a man should deny the satisfaction of Christ, than believe it and abuse it to the encouragement of sin. Of the two, I have more hopes of him that denies the divinity of Christ, and lives otherwise soberly and righteously and godly in the world, than of the man who owns Christ to be the Son of God, and lives like a child of the devil.'†

Natural religion more certain than revealed.

In a sermon on the resurrection of the body, Tillotson has apprehended St. Paul's meaning better than the Fathers and theologians, who insisted on the literal resurrection of the 'flesh.' It is not the material vile body which

* This is even carried so far as to place the duty of mothers nursing their own children above that of keeping the laws of revealed religion. 'This I foresee will seem a very hard saying to nice and delicate mothers, who prefer their own ease and pleasure to the fruit of their own bodies, but whether they will hear or whether they will forbear, I think myself obliged to deal plainly in this matter, and to be so faithful as to tell them that this is a natural duty, and because it is so, of a more necessary and indispensable obligation than any positive precept of revealed religion, and that the general neglect of it is one of the great and crying sins of this age and nation.'—Vol. iv. p. 453, ed. 1741.

† Vol. xii. p. 294.

as been buried that rises again, but a glorious body alto- CHAP. VIII.
ether spiritual; that is, such a body as shall not impede the
perations of the spirit. 'We shall then be, as it were, all
pirit.'* In another sermon, on the immortality of the
oul, the objection that the arguments from immateriality
re equally valid for the immortality of brutes, is answered
precisely as it was afterwards answered by Bishop Butler.
There is no inconvenience,' Tillotson says, 'in attributing
his sort of immortality to the brute creatures.'† The con-
inuance of it depends on the will of God. The probability,
owever, is that they do not continue after the dissolution
f their bodies. And this is founded on the principle which
as largely explained by Lord Herbert, that the soul of
an was of a higher nature; that it has a sense of things
piritual and divine. It has a capacity to know God.‡

Archbishop Sharp passed for a more orthodox theologian than Tillotson. He had more of the old leaven, but he was no stranger to the new. He entered Cambridge in 1660, and came under the influence of Cudworth and the Latitudinarians. When Vicar of St. Giles-in-the-Fields, he gained great reputation as a preacher, while his Protestant zeal brought him under the displeasure of King James. He went heartily with the Revolution, but it was some time before he could overcome his belief in the doctrine of non-resistance; and though he regarded the sees of the non-juring bishops as legally vacant, he yet refused to accept any of them, through respect for the men who had made such great sacrifices for the sake of conscience. On the questions of Protestantism, conformity, and the relations of faith and reason, Sharp agreed essentially with Tillotson. The prevailing reason for conformity in Sharp's time was the

Archbishop Sharp.

* Vol. ix. p. 344.

† Vol. ix. p. 78.

‡ Tillotson was charged with Socinianism, Hobbism, denying the eternity of hell punishments, and many other heresies; but they were chiefly the inventions of Hickes, Leslie, and other Nonjurors. He once said, in a sermon preached before King Charles, that 'no man is obliged to preach against the religion of a country, though a false one, unless he has the power of working miracles.' Charles slept most of the time, but after the sermon a nobleman said to him, 'It's pity your Majesty slept, for we have had the rarest piece of Hobbism that ever you heard in your life.' 'Oddsfish,' said the king, 'he shall print it then.' The sermon was printed, and John Howe expostulated with Tillotson, who is said to have been convinced that he was wrong. See Calamy's 'Nonconformists' Memorial,' under Howe.

CHAP. VIII.

nationality of the Church. It was urged on all En men to conform to the Church because it was the C of England. Every Christian was regarded as a mem the National Church, and therefore it was said he ough be of the communion of the Church. Sharp plead these reasons, but he had a background of belief, tha Church of England claimed allegiance not merely a State Church, but in virtue of its ecclesiastical constitu He believed in a divinely appointed ministry through w the divine favour was specially to come. 'The privileg the gospel,' he says, 'such as pardon of sin, and the g of the Holy Spirit, are not conveyed to us so immedia by God, but there must intervene the necessity of God's word and sacraments are the channels in which are delivered to us, and those to whom He hath commi the ministry of reconciliation and the power of the keys the hands that must dispense them. We have no pro of spiritual graces but by these means. So that, in order to the partaking of them, there is an absolute necessity laid upon us of joining and communicating with the Church.'*

On the Church.

This doctrine of the Church was evidently a substratum of the argument, and yet it cannot be said that Sharp took the illiberal side. 'The articles of the faith,' he adds, 'are but few, and so clearly set down in the Scripture, that it is impossible for any sincere man to miss their meaning. The questions on which men differ are not the essentials. They do not concern the Christian life, but only notions and speculations. A man may go to heaven though he holds the wrong side on such questions. God will look more to the sincerity of men's hearts than to the accuracy of their notions on subjects purely speculative. Our differences are not so wide as they are represented, but they might be easily made up with a little allowance to men's words and phrases.'†

* Archbishop Sharp's Works, vol. i. p. 6. Thomas Wadsworth, one of the ejected ministers, wrote an answer to this sermon, maintaining that the Nonconformists were not in schism; though separated from the Conformists, they were still members of one Church.

† Sharp shared in the general dislike of liberal theologians to the damnatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed. There is a story that he was once going to church with a clergyman, and on the way the clergyman said to the Archbishop that he had almost forgotten that it was a day on

CHAP. VIII.

On the truth of Christianity.

Sharp's arguments for the truths of Christianity are akin to Tillotson's. The favourite text of both was the words of Abraham in the parable, concerning the rich man's five brethren, 'If they believe not Moses and the prophets, neither will they believe though one rose from the dead.' The general ground on which the argument rests, though not always clearly expressed either by Sharp or Tillotson, is that the real root of unbelief is an error of the heart. Sharp applies it in this way, but connects it with arguments which can have to do only with the faculty of reasoning. The Christian revelation, he says, is so well attested, that it is of more force to persuade men than the continuance of agencies from the unseen world. Those, therefore, who reject Christianity on its present evidence, would also reject a miracle which they saw with their own eyes, or a messenger from heaven. They would still plead the want of absolute certainty. The miracle might be a deception, and the messenger might be a deceiver. Those who lived in Christ's time, and who saw His works, had greater evidence than if a special miracle had been wrought for their conversion. Now we have an exact account of these works, made by honest men, never questioned by the first adversaries of the Christian religion, and therefore Sharp concludes that the evidence to us is as good as it was to the first Christians, and thus greater than if one rose from the dead. To this argument several others are added which were unknown to the first Christians. These are called standing proofs. Among them are enumerated the rapid success of Christianity in the world, the peace of mind which it brings to the true Christian, and the fulfilment of the prophecies concerning the destruction of Jerusalem and the dispersion of the Jews. One is also derived from the analogy between a standing revelation, attested once for all, and the ordinary works of Providence. All nature proceeds according to settled and natural causes. It has nothing special. The only exceptions are when a necessity emerges for the interference of Divine Omnipotence. To these correspond the occasional exceptions of interference with the standing revelation.

which the Athanasian Creed was to be read. The Archbishop answered 'Why didn't you forget?'

CHAP. VIII.

This conception was a step of progress beyond Baxter's continuous miracles, but only in the direction that miracles are less frequent and Christianity more independent of them.

On predestination.

On predestination the Archbishop took the middle way between Arminius and Calvin. He denied reprobation, and so opened the way for the rejection of the whole of Calvin's scheme. He said a great deal about the necessity of church-membership for salvation, and yet he did not limit the number of the saved even to those who were within the pale of Christianity. Nor did he believe that the saved would be a small number, not even small in comparison with the whole of the human race. He would rather believe with the psalmist that the tender mercies of God are over all His works. 'I should think,' he says, 'that man both immodest and rash that should pass a sentence of damnation upon all Jews, Turks, or heathens, much more upon all his fellow Christians, though they be not so good as he, or though they may have the misfortune to be of a different persuasion or communion from him.'*

Faith and reason.

Sharp's views of faith and reason are but the echo of Tillotson's. No man indeed can consistently adopt any other views who with all his heart renounces the Church of Rome. Faith and reason, Sharp says, can never be in opposition. No article of religion is to be believed unless it is sufficiently evident to produce conviction. He says expressly 'that we have no other way to judge or to be convinced of the truth of any matter of faith or article of religion but the agreeableness of it with the principles of our natural reason.'† There may be things in revelation not discoverable by reason, or even when revealed not fully comprehended. But they are never unintelligible. They never, like the doctrine of transubstantiation, contradict the testimony of sense. The Incarnation and the Trinity must from their nature be beyond the understanding of finite minds, yet we can form 'a consistent notion of them.' The necessity of using reason is proved against the Roman Catholic. He too must reason till he finds the true Church. The difference is that the Protestant seeks for the doctrines which Christ has revealed, and by them he judges concerning the Church.

* Vol. iii. p. 102. † Vol. vii. p. 4.

CHAP. VIII.

The Sabbath.

On the Sabbath question Archbishop Sharp was essentially Puritan. According to his account the word Sabbath was then in common use, yet he preferred the name Sunday. He returns, however, to defend its use on the ground of its meaning. We are not to keep a Jewish Sabbath, yet we are to keep a Sabbath or day of rest. The obligation dates from creation. All nations reckon time by weeks of seven days. The Jews were commanded by the law of Moses to keep the seventh day, not merely in memory of the rest of creation but of the deliverance from Egypt. This is the reason given in the Book of Deuteronomy, where the creation is not mentioned. God appointed for all nations one day in seven, in memory of creation. To the Jews the one day was the seventh, 'because that on that day He delivered His people from the bondage of Egypt with a mighty hand and an outstretched arm.'* As the law of the Sabbath is in the decalogue, it must be, Sharp says, in a sense a moral law. Christ never repealed it. The first Christians changed the day, but still recognised the obligation of one in seven. By the laws of the land and of the Church the first day of the week is to be kept holy, and our reverence for these laws ought to bind us to keep that day.

The Eucharist.

The same moderation is discernible in Sharp's views of the Eucharist. He was quite disposed to connect superstition with the Sacraments. But his Protestantism saved him. The discourse in the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel he interpreted as independent of the Lord's Supper, and the eating there spoken of as believing. Had it been eating the real body of Christ in the supper, then those who heard that discourse could have had no life in them, for the supper was not instituted till a year after. The same is also true of children and all persons dying before they receive the communion. The Church of England, Sharp says, holds a 'real presence.' But it is altogether unlike the Roman doctrine. Partaking of the body of Christ is a spiritual benefit. To the worthy receivers the thing signified accompanies the sign, but there is no real presence of a natural body, and so no absurdity, as in the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation. For this view of the

* Vol. iv. p. 229.

CHAP. VIII.

real presence, Sharp quotes the old Saxon Homilies an endorses Cranmer's reply to Gardiner that Christ is 'n corporally in the outward signs nor corporally in the pe sons that duly receive' the sacraments. In the true spir of the English Church the benefit of the Eucharist is finall explained as the same in kind with the spiritual benef which accompanies any other act of worship sincerely pe formed.

Bishop Kidder.

Richard Kidder, who was made Bishop of Bath and Well had, like Tillotson, been educated among the Puritans. I 1662 he was ejected by the Act of Uniformity from th living of Stanground, in Huntingdonshire. He afterward conformed, and for some years held the Rectory of St. Ma tin's Outwich, in the city of London. He was then promote to the deanery of Peterborough, and from thence to the se of Bath and Wells. Kidder was a zealous Protestant, judicious churchman, and an ardent promoter of all me sures for toleration and comprehension. He was a frien of Dr. Cudworth, and he confesses to an agreement on man points with the great Platonist. But Kidder's theology remarkably orthodox. He had no genius for religious spe culation. Destitute of the angularities of a Puritan thec logian, he yet retained the substance of Puritan theology His studies were chiefly confined to the Scriptures, and hi reputation rested mainly on his acquaintance with Hebrew and Rabbinical learning.

The 'Demonstration of the Messias.'

His great work is his 'Demonstration of the Messias.' It was written chiefly with a view to the conversion of the Jews, but with a hope that it might also be useful against th Deists. Part of it was delivered as the Boyle Lectures fc 1693. The Jewish objections were contained in the Nitzchon, the Chirzuck Emunah of Rabbi Isaac, and a Portuguese MS., which had been given to Dr. Cudworth, by Menasse Ben Israel. The Deists to whom Kidder refers are Hobbes, Spinoza, and the author of a book called 'Præ-Adamitæ.' These are the only authors mentioned, and Kidder shares the popular belief that Hobbes and Spinoza were mere scoffing Deists. He speaks of Atheism and contempt of all revealed religion as having been prevalent for several years. 'We have lived,' he says, 'to see Moses derided, his history

diculed and exposed, and the writings of the New Testa-
ıent made the matter of drollery and profane contempt.
Ve have those among us who are forward to carp at and
nd flaws in the sacred volumes, and that industriously
ıake it their business to run down the inspiration, and over-
ırow the credit, of those holy oracles.'* If this refers to
.obbes and Spinoza it is not true. They neither deal in
rollery nor ridicule. It looks like a prophecy of the Deists
ıat were to come. Kidder says that in his answers he has
ɜed no artifice, and laid hold of no pretexts. This impar-
ality and fairness will be granted by all critics. He adds, 'I
ıink a Christian ought, in these matters, to be scrupulously
ıst, and to use all imaginable simplicity. Our holy religion
ɜeds no arts or shifts. It is built upon sure grounds, and
ɜeds not fear the strongest reasoning, and the greatest wits,
ıat make head against it.'

Against the Jews.

We are not to forget that the 'Demonstration of the Mes-
as' is addressed to Jews. It contains arguments valid,
hen addressed to them, but often of no weight against
eists, who did not admit the same premises. Kidder wishes
ıis to be remembered. The title indicates the theme,
hich is to prove that 'our Jesus is the Christ.' It is ad-
itted by Jews that a Messias was promised in the Old
ɜstament writings. About the time of Christ's coming, the
ɜws generally expected that the time of their Messias was
hand. It is also a fact in history that about this time
ere was a general expectation throughout the world that a
ɜeat person was to appear, with whom was to begin a new
a. Kidder goes through the well-known Messianic pro-
ɜecies, as the 'Woman's seed,' the 'Seed of Abraham,'
e 'Shiloh,' the 'Star out of Jacob,' the 'King of the
ouse of David;' also the prophecies quoted in the New
ɜstament, which were understood to refer to the birth, life,
ıaracter, and death of Jesus, as the promised Messias.
ɜ to His lineage and kindred, He was to be of the house
ıd family of David, a root of Jesse, and a righteous branch
ıised up to David. He was, therefore, to be of the tribe of
ıdah, David's seed that was to endure for ever, and His
ırone as the days of heaven. He was to be born in Beth-

Prophecies of the Messias.

* Preface to Part II.

CHAP. VIII.

lehem, according to the prophet Micah, the Chaldee paraphrast, and Jonathan the Targumist. He was to be born of a virgin, according to the prophet Isaiah, and the time of His coming was to be towards the end of the Jewish polity, before the sceptre departed from Judah. This is made to synchronize with the end of the seventy weeks of Daniel and the coming of the 'Messenger of the Covenant' to the second temple. Though born in Bethlehem, He was to make glorious the land of Zebulon and the land of Nephthalim, by the way of the sea beyond Jordan, Galilee of the Gentiles. As the desire of nations, He was to give, by His presence, greater glory to the second temple than had ever belonged to the first. He was to be meek and lowly, not to strive nor cry in the streets. He was to open the eyes of the blind, unstop the ears of the deaf, and make the dumb to speak.

Maimonides said that the Messias was not to work miracles, nor to make any innovations on the law of Moses. In answer to this, Bishop Kidder enters at some length on the question of miracles. On this subject he says nothing different from what had been said by Tillotson. A miracle is defined as a supernatural work evident to the senses. It is, therefore, frequently called a sign. Jesus, in His first miracles, manifested His glory, and His disciples believed on Him. Abravenel was not of the opinion of Maimonides concerning the Messias and miracles. He rather says that the miracles of the Messias will be so great that the Israelites shall forget the miracles which were wrought for them by the hand of Moses. The Jews in Christ's time expected the Messias to work miracles. The apostle says the 'Jews require a sign,' and the Scribes and Pharisees said, 'Master, we would see a sign from thee.' Their own testimony was, When Christ cometh will He do more miracles than this man hath done? Maimonides said also that the Israelites did not believe Moses because of the miracles, and that miracles cannot be a proof of doctrine, because of the danger of deception. Against this it was easy to quote the testimony of other Jews, and many passages from Old Testament history, where God is said to work miracles for the purpose of producing belief. The plague of frogs was re-

Was the Messias to work miracles?

moved that Pharaoh might know there was 'none like unto the Lord our God.' The widow whose son Elijah raised from the dead, knew by this miracle that the prophet was a man of God. The Jews were not 'condemned by Jesus for seeking a sign, but because they did it tempting Him.'

Miracles a good testimony.

Kidder's conclusion is that miracles are a good testimony, provided we can distinguish between true miracles and those that are false. It is admitted that this is a matter of some difficulty, and the difficulty is greater on the principle laid down both by Kidder and Tillotson, that the works of evil spirits are really miracles, though wrought for an evil object. In testing the miracles of Jesus, we are recommended to consider several things, both separately and together. Jesus was a man of innocent life. His doctrines were like Himself, holy, just, and good. They were destructive of the devil's kingdom, for He cast the devil out of the bodies and the souls of men. They were great miracles, raising the dead, curing long and inveterate diseases, opening the eyes of the blind with a touch, and feeding thousands with a few loaves and fishes. They were miracles of mercy. They were done publicly, and they were all perfect and complete. The persons healed were made every whit whole. They surpassed the miracles of Moses, which the Jews always held sufficient to confirm the mission of their lawgiver. Moses was but an instrument, while Jesus worked miracles at will. His miracles were unlike those pretended by the Church of Rome. They were not ridiculous nor trifling, like the story of the Virgin Mary's house travelling about till it settled at Loretto, of sheep and asses running to hear St. Francis preaching, of St. Dominic forcing the devil to hold the candle till he said his devotions, or of St. Denys, after he was beheaded, carrying his head under his arm. The miracles of Jesus were unlike Pagan miracles. Vespasian and Adrian may have cured the blind. Kidder says that what is recorded of Vespasian cannot fairly be denied, since it is affirmed by good authors. It is, besides, probable that God may have wrought miracles by one who was to be the instrument of punishing the Jews for their rejection of the Messias. But the miracles of Vespasian were far short of those of Jesus. The miracles ascribed to Apollonius Tyanæus are not to be

CHAP. VIII.

mentioned. He is said to have cured a youth of dropsy by inculcating temperance. Some of his miracles are impious, encouraging idolatry and the worship of false gods. He was, besides, a wicked man, proud, haughty, and vaunting his knowledge, while in reality he was very ignorant.

Evidence that Jesus wrought miracles.

An objection is raised that we may not have sufficient assurance that Jesus really did the miracles ascribed to Him. Kidder answers that we have such proof as the thing is capable of, and that it is unreasonable to expect more. It is called perversity to refuse here the same kind of arguments that satisfy us in other things. Origen justly reasoned with the Jews, that if they believed Moses, who was said to have done supernatural works, they could have no ground for rejecting Jesus. Pagan authors testify that there was such a person as Jesus, and that He did mighty works. We can have no just reason for questioning the truth of the gospel history. The books are genuine. The writers were witnesses of the things which they record. They all agree in the main story, though there are some variations in detail, which, however, are easily reconciled.

The Messias was to suffer.

It is proved against the Jews that the Messias was to suffer. This suffering Bishop Kidder explains as a satisfaction for sin. His resurrection and ascension prove Him to have been the Son of God. The evidence of the resurrection is estimated at nothing more nor less than we estimate the evidence of any ordinary event. The human testimony is unexceptionable. It comes from His disciples, who bear witness to what they saw with their own eyes. It was predicted that the Messias should rise from the dead and ascend into heaven. This is proved by such passages in the Psalms as 'Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee,' and 'Lift up your heads, O ye gates; be ye lift up, ye everlasting doors, that the King of glory may come in.' Kidder demonstrates with great learning, classical, Rabbinical, and Chaldean, that the earth is our mother, and therefore of the resurrection of Jesus it was said 'This day have I begotten Thee.'

Owing to an irregularity in the construction of his treatise, Bishop Kidder repeats these arguments, adding explanations of difficulties and solving objections. For this work he had great capacity. His answers generally are solid and

atisfactory. If the objection is ingenious, the answer is sure o equal it in ingenuity. The greatest difficulty is admitted o be that which concerns the genealogies of Jesus. Yet Kidder says it is unfair for the Jews to make much of this. Jesus was allowed by the Jews of His own time to be of the ıouse of David, which is all that the genealogies are in-ended to prove. They prove this, even if they are only the genealogies of Joseph, who was not the father of Jesus. Every man had to marry into his own tribe, and therefore Mary must have been of the tribe of Judah. It would be easy, Bishop Kidder says, to perplex any Jew with difficulties in the names and numbers of the Old Testament. The books of the genealogies are now lost, and the difficulties connected with those of Matthew and Luke are the same in kind as are common to all Jewish genealogies. The quotations from the Old Testament in St. Matthew are vindicated from the objections made by the Jews. Yet Kidder admits that some of them may be merely accommodations. 'That it might be fulfilled' may only mean that something has happened similar to some former event.*

Jewish genealogies uncertain.

Bishop Kidder wrote, also, a 'Commentary on the Five Books of Moses.' This was his portion of a joint work proposed to be executed by the London ministers for the benefit of families. But most of his fellow-workers were unable to accomplish their parts, because of the necessity of engaging in the great controversy in defence of the Protestant religion in the time of James. Kidder had assigned to

* Bishop Kidder ventured an interpretation of unfulfilled prophecy, which he threw out for the consideration of the reader. In 1729, the Waldenses and Albigenses were to ascend up into heaven. (Rev. xi. 12.) This year is the end of Daniel's 'time, and times, and half a time.' There were to be terrible battles. Popery, the antichristian hierarchy, was to receive the fatal blow. In 1730 Germany was to be reformed. In 1731 Spain was to be reformed. In 1732 Savoy, and the adjacent parts of Italy. In 1733 was to come the end of the Papal hierarchy, and Rome was to be levelled to the ground. In 1736 all the potentates of Europe were to throw off the Popish yoke. In 1735, Europe begins to enjoy a general peace, following the destruction of Antichrist. In 1768, the Jews, now settled in Canaan, were to place the several tribes in their order, rebuild the city of Jerusalem, and erect a famous church for the worship of the true God. In 1804, the Turks were to be conquered by the Jews, and their empire torn to pieces. This was to be the pouring out of the seventh vial. There was to be a great increase of the Gospel. Ezekiel's waters are risen so high, that there is water to swim in. (Ez. xlvii. 5.) In 2014, the Millennium begins; all the world is of one religion, and all nations at peace with each other.

CHAP. VIII.

On the Pentateuch.

him the Books of Moses. He prefixed a Dissertation concerning the author, in which he answered the usual objections brought against their having been written by Moses The objections are chiefly those with which we are still familiar, and the answers are as good as any that have been made since that time.* The bishop rejects the theory of emendations or additions by the hand of Ezra, or any other supposed editor of the Scriptures. To admit this, he says, would be to make them uncertain,—to leave us without any knowledge who wrote them, and without the means of determining which parts are to be received and which rejected. The account of the death and burialof Moses, however, is explained as a postscript by another hand, like the postscripts at the end of the Epistles, or the conclusion of the seventy-second Psalm: 'The prayers of Jesse, the son of David, are ended.'

* Kidder's answers to the objections against the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch are of some interest and value. It was objected that Moses could not have written Deut. i. 1. He never entered Canaan, and yet he is introduced here as recording what he said to Israel in the wilderness 'on the other side Jordan.' The bishop answers, that the Hebrew here translated as 'the other side,' is as frequently translated 'on this side,' and that Josephus translates the text 'near Jordan.' The next objection concerns the kings of Edom, who are said to have reigned before 'any king reigned in Israel.' (Gen. xxxvi. 3.) How could Moses write this? He was dead before any king reigned in Israel. In this chapter eight kings are mentioned as succeeding each other in Edom, precisely the number of generations from Jacob to Obed, the grandfather of David. Kidder answers, that from the marriage of Esau to the death of Moses there were three hundred and forty-four years, ample time for eight successive kings, and Moses must have known that there were to be kings in Israel, for he delivers laws concerning them in Deut. xvii. Moreover, Moses was himself a king. He was 'king in Jeshurun,' and this was not a new title, for it is evident from the history that he was really a king. It is added as a thing possible, that these eight kings may have been Horites, descended from Hori in the land of Seir. They reigned in Edom, but it is not said that they were the children of Esau. Another objection is, from the names of places. For instance, Hebron and Dan did not bear these names in the time of Moses. In Joshua xiv. 15, it is said, 'The name of Hebron was Kirjath-arba;' and the origin of the name of Dan is recorded in Judges xviii. 29. Kidder answers, that it is not certain that Kirjath-arba was not called Hebron in the time of Moses. It is so called by Joshua (xv. 13), who was contemporary with Moses. It is only an assumption, that the Dan of Gen. xiv. 14 is the Dan of Judges. Moreover, Dan was a very ancient name. It is traced as part of the word Jordan. Josephus says, that Abraham fell upon the Assyrians 'about Dan, for so the other fountain, or spring-head, of Jordan was called.' In Gen. xii. 6, it is said 'The Canaanite was then in the land.' Hobbes and Spinoza had both remarked that the Canaanite was in the land for four hundred years after Moses, which makes the statement impertinent coming from Moses. It must have been added after the destruction of the Canaanites. Kidder's answer is, that the words mean simply that the land promised to Abraham was then in the possession of the Ca-

CHAP. VIII.

Bishop Patrick.

Simon Patrick was appointed to the bishopric of Chichester, on the death of Bishop Lake. In 1691 he was translated to Ely. Tillotson and Kidder succeeded to bishoprics held by Nonjurors, but it is probable that Patrick would have refused to take any of their sees. He was, however, an ardent supporter of the Revolution, and had no sympathy with the Nonjurors in their attachment to James II. Patrick is sometimes classed with the Cambridge Platonists, but what he has in common with them is due more to the accident of education than to any original individuality. His writings are mostly practical, exhibiting sometimes an ecstatic piety, but with no trace of capacity for metaphysics, or the higher philosophy.* Indeed, throughout Patrick's life, as well as his writings, his greatest and most manifest quality is practical wisdom. This was his guide from his early youth, when, resisting temptations of success in business, he made his way to Cambridge without money, determined to be a scholar. He was more opposed to the Puritans than was becoming in a Latitudinarian. In his autobiography he is at some pains to show that his father was not a Puritan. He had been reckoned a Puritan by his neighbours because of his pious life, his strictness in observing the Sabbath, and arranging his household so that

naanites. It is merely a statement that the Canaanites possessed the land, and has no reference to their final extirpation. Again, the land may mean the land of Sichem, in which the Canaanites were destroyed by the children of Jacob before the Israelites went into Egypt. There is also the mention of the bedstead of Og, the King of Bashan, in Deut. iii. 11, where it is unlikely that Moses should speak of the bedstead as a relic preserved in Rabboth, when he was himself contemporary with the King of Bashan; and in verse 14 it is said that Jair, the son of Manasseh, called the coasts of Geshuri and Maachathi after his own name 'unto this day.' This expression implies that they had this name for a long time when these words were written, and therefore they could not have been written by Moses. To the first objection Kidder answers, that Moses wrote for posterity; and to the second he answered, that 'unto this day' does not necessarily refer to the lapse of a great period of time. St. Matthew speaks of a saying as commonly reported among the Jews, 'unto this day,' which concerned an event that had taken place in his own time. In Exodus xvi. 35, the children of Israel are said to have eaten manna forty years till they came to the land of Canaan, which could not have been written by Moses, as he did not live till the end of the forty years, and never entered Canaan. This is answered, by the uncertainty of the tense of the verb translated 'did eat.' It might with equal propriety be rendered 'shall eat.' It is so rendered in Psalm xxii., 'All they that be fat upon earth shall eat and worship.'

* The only collected edition of his works is by the Rev. Alexander Taylor, in nine volumes, without the Commentaries. It was published in 1858.

CHAP. VIII.

every one could go to church. But Patrick vindicates his father from this as an undeserved reproach, testifying that he never objected to the Book of Common Prayer, and that the sermons which he read in his family were those of the 'famous Dr. Sanderson.'

At Cambridge.

Bishop Patrick went to Cambridge with recommendations to Whichcot and Cudworth, expecting a sizarship at King's or Emanuel. These colleges were full, but he was recommended to Queen's, where he was soon noticed and assisted by the Master, Herbert Palmer, one of the leaders in the Westminster Assembly.* Here he met John Smith, who was then a fellow of Queen's, the marvel of the University, and giving fair promise to be the wonder of that age. 'His memory,' Patrick says, 'is most blessed. He died August 7, 1652, much lamented. But blessed be God for the good I got by him while he lived.'† At this time Patrick was much troubled about the doctrine of absolute predestination. He was forbidden to exercise 'carnal reason' upon it. He told Smith his difficulties, who assured him that his reasons against it were sound, and made such a representation of the nature of God, and His good-will to men in Christ Jesus, that Patrick was ever after established in the belief 'that God would really have all men to be saved.'‡ In giving up predestination, Patrick

* Patrick says, 'Herbert Palmer took some notice of me, and sent for me to transcribe some things he intended for the press, and soon after made me the college scribe, which brought me in a great deal of money, many leases being to be renewed. It was not long before I had one of the best scholarships in the College bestowed upon me, so that I was advanced to a higher rank, being made a pensioner. But before I was Bachelor of Arts that good man died, who was of an excellent spirit, and was unwearied in doing good. Though he was a little crooked man, yet he had such an authority, that the Fellows reverenced him as much as we do them, going bare when he passed through the Court, which, after his death was disused.'—Vol. ix. p. 416.

† Vol. ix. p. 418.

‡ More than half a century after Smith's death, Bishop Patrick, referring to his funeral sermon, said, 'I could only declare how much I was transported in my admiration of him, who spoke of God and religion so as I never heard man speak. Once I remember, speaking of the being of God, he told me that perhaps he had reason to believe there was a God, above most, if not all other men. I have often since blamed myself that I was not so bold as to inquire what he meant, but modesty becomes young men, especially to their superiors, and a profound reverence for him as vastly above me, though not in years, for he was but thirty-two years old when he died. Lord! what a man he would have been if he had lived so long as I have done, when he had attained to such a pitch of perfection at those years.'—Vol. ix. p. 423.

Patrick's tutor was John Wells, who

had taken an important step towards separation from the Puritans. He had been ordained by a Presbytery, but on reading Hammond and Thorndike he was convinced of the necessity of ordination by a bishop. He was ordained privately by Bishop Hall, but continued to officiate as a Presbyterian. He submitted to Cromwell's triers before he was inducted to the Vicarage of Battersea. At the Restoration he was ready for the return of the Prayer-book. But with characteristic prudence he did not introduce it suddenly. He prepared his people for it by sermons on the lawfulness and the utility of forms of prayer in public worship. Unity and peace, he said, without the Prayer-book, were better than discord with it.

Becomes a Conformist.

Patrick's sympathies were all on the side of conformity. He was not forgetful of what he owed to individual Puritans, but he was never one in spirit with the Puritan party. He had never believed the divine decrees. He had repudiated ordination by the classes. With the approbation of the Platonists, he had preached in St. Mary's against the Phariseeism of Cromwell's government, which appointed fast days, and yet unjustly imposed on peaceable royalists the burden of supporting a national militia. It was then no marvel that he hailed both the return of the king and the restoration of the bishops.

On the Sacraments.

The earliest of Patrick's writings are on the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. To both of these Sacraments he attaches great importance. The first treatise is in the form of a sermon preached at the baptism of the infant son of 'a Minister in Lombard Street.' It was published at the urgent request of this minister, and other friends. This sermon is sometimes quoted to mark the progress among the Puritans of a return to sounder views on the nature and efficacy of the sacraments. But the

was afterwards Vicar of St. Ives, in Huntingdonshire, where he continued till 1665, having conformed at the Restoration. Patrick says, 'I thank God for having given me such a kind loving tutor, of extraordinary affection to me, which he expressed sundry ways, exceeding my account.' In 1644 all the fellows of Queen's refused to take the Covenant, and were ejected. Those who came in their places were chiefly from Emanuel, where Cudworth was Master, and Whichcot, until this year, one of the tutors, when he was made Provost of King's. Among the new fellows of Queen's were John Wells and John Smith.

CHAP. VIII.

The Puritan doctrine of Sacraments.

criticism is groundless. It is made in ignorance of the Puritan doctrine of the Sacraments. During the time of the Commonwealth there was the same diversity of sentiment concerning the efficacy of sacraments that has always existed in the Church of England.* The genuine Calvinist never denied baptismal regeneration. He simply confined it to elect infants. This is the proper interpretation of the strong language of such writers as Cranmer, Jewel, and Hooker on the grace of baptism. This language was continued by the Puritans of the Commonwealth. They believed in the baptismal regeneration of elect children. Modern Nonconformists are perplexed with the sentiments on this subject which are found in such decided Puritans as Thomas Jacomb and Thomas Goodwin.† Patrick, not being a Calvinist in theology, could not speak so strongly of the efficacy of baptism as some of the Puritans. Whatever the baptismal grace might be, it was, he said, the same to all baptized children. He gave sublime illustrations from Plato, Philo, and the Old Testament, concerning the relation of the invisible substance to the earthly patterns, and the invisible grace to the visible signs. But when the whole of his doctrine is analysed his view of baptism turns out in reality to be a very low view. It is built entirely on the supposition of a covenant, to which we are admitted by this ordinance. There is, he says, at least a relative change. Henceforth 'we stand upon rather better terms than mere nature did instate us in.' We are made God's children, and have a title to an inheritance, which we receive on our being faithful to our part of the covenant.‡ Some secret and manifold operations besides this relative change are supposed to be probable, yet, as we know nothing about them, Patrick rests his argument for the great importance of baptism on the view of its being admission to the covenant. But this covenant at last becomes a myth. Patrick admits that men may be saved without being in this covenant. He quotes with approbation from the book of Nitzchon that 'he that doth believe aright is a Jew, though he be

Baptism explained as admission to a covenant.

* See Vol. I. pp. 209 and 231 of the present work.

† See Dr. Stoughton's 'Church of the Restoration,' vol. ii. p. 432.

‡ Vol. i. pp. 31–2.

t circumcised.'* He says, indeed, that without the
venant of baptism no man can be saved. But then fol-
vs an explanation that by covenant of baptism is meant a
ıristian life. In the same spirit Patrick adds arguments
· the value of Confirmation. The benefits are in words
:ribed to the rite, yet they are meant only of the utility of
e rite. It is a renewal of the baptismal engagement, and
opportunity for instruction at an important period of life.
ıe Holy Ghost is said to be given in baptism as a 'sanc-
ier,' and in confirmation as a 'strengthener.' Yet the
ıctification and strengthening depend on our fulfilling the
:ms of the covenant. And these terms are not mere com-
ance with the rites, but living the life which by the rites
e are engaged to live.

'Mensa Mystica.'

The treatise on the Lord's Supper called 'Mensa Mystica,'
written on the same principles. All the superstitions of
e Church of Rome, and everything like an effect 'ex
ere operato' are renounced. Roman Catholics called the
ɔmmunion of the Church of England 'John Calvin's Sup-
r,' and made charges freely of heresy and schism, which
ıtrick says are mere 'bugbear words,' to frighten weak
ıd credulous people. He argues on the clearest principles
' reason that salvation cannot be suspended on the acci-
ent of receiving certain rites, or of belonging to a certain
ırty. The claim of the Roman Catholic is treated as
iogenes treated the invitation of the Pagan priest, who
ked Diogenes to be of his order, that he might be happy
the other world. 'Wouldst thou have me believe,' said
e philosopher, 'that Epaminondas and other brave men
:e miserable, and thou, who art but an ass, and dost
othing worthy, shalt be happy, because thou art a priest?'
hey whose hearts are full of God, and have His image
ining in their souls, cannot be excluded from heaven.
leither can they enter there whose lives are evil, how-
ever orthodox their creed. Patrick maintains in the Sacra-
ment a 'real' presence, which he immediately explains
after the fashion of those who do not really believe a real
resence. The elements exhibit 'our Lord Himself unto
elieving minds, and put them into a surer possession of

* Vol. i. p. 20.

CHAP. VIII.

Him.' The 'real presence is not to be sought in the bread and wine, but only in those that receive them, according as learned Hooker speaks. For Christ saith first, *Take and eat*, and then after that, *This is my body*. Before we take and eat it is not the body of Christ unto us, but when we take and eat as we ought, then He gives us His whole self and puts us into possession of all such saving graces as His sacrificed body can yield, and our souls do then need.'* Patrick adds to the same effect that the change is in our souls, and not in the sacrament. We are 'metamorphosed and transformed by this sacrament.' Yet, in order to have this change, the sacrament must be received worthily. For then only is it the body and blood of Christ, otherwise it is but bare bread and wine.

On the 'real presence.'

This view of the 'real presence' is made the occasion for using language quite as strong as can be found in any Roman Catholic writers. All the delights of religion are spoken of as coming by participation in this sacrament. It is here we are to taste and see that God is good, and to be satisfied with the goodness of His house, even of His holy temple. Here we are to see the most glorious thing in heaven, even the body of the great King. Here we are to be feasted at a royal table, filled with the Holy Ghost, and take into our hands 'the only begotten Son of God.'* Dryden, describing what was supposed to be the Anglican theory of the sacrament of the Supper, says,—

> 'A real presence all her sons allow,
> And yet 'tis flat idolatry to bow,
> Because the Godhead's there they know not how.'

He concludes the verse with the famous line:—

> 'Nonsense never can be understood.'

The sacrifice of the Supper.

Patrick's 'Mensa Mystica' was written in Puritan times, and was received by the Puritans as not disagreeing with their view of this sacrament. It was dedicated to Sir Walter and Lady St. John, in whose house Patrick was domestic chaplain previous to his undertaking the charge of Battersea. A great deal of learning is employed in comparing this sacrifice with the different kinds of sacrifice among the Jews. The

* Vol. i. p. 151. † Vol. i. p. 287.

legal sacrifices were remembrances of sin, but our sacrifice is a remembrance of the remission of sin. The Jews did not eat of the expiatory sacrifice, but we eat of the sacrifice of expiation. A parallel or a contrast is equally acceptable and equally conclusive so far as argument is concerned. But here, as in the sacrament of baptism, everything is referred to the covenant. It is a covenant right. We do not make 'a bare remembrance' of Christ's death, but a lively and affectionate commemoration of what Christ has done for us. The communion or participation of Christ's body is explained as declaring our faith in Christ.* The condition of the covenant comes at last to be simply faith. This itself is to eat Christ's flesh and drink His blood. For this interpretation of these words in St. John's gospel Patrick quotes St. Basil, and refers to the testimony of other ancient Fathers. By eating bread and drinking wine in the Eucharist we do something more than Jesus meant in that discourse. Our eating and drinking is not merely an act of faith, it is also an open profession of our faith and membership in the Church. With Bishop Patrick the Lord's Supper, apart from his undefined theory of a covenant, is really after all nothing more than a simple memorial of Christ's death. And lest his frequent use of the word sacrifice should lead to any idea of a proper priesthood, he says that every Christian is a priest when he comes to the table of the Lord.†

'The Witnesses of Christianity.'

Patrick wrote a long treatise on 'The Witnesses of Christianity; or the Certainty of our Faith and Hope.' It is addressed to believers. 'Surely,' he says 'there are no infidels among us.' It is only with believers that the arguments could have any weight. The treatise is of no value on the great question of evidences, which had now begun to be discussed. Patrick appears never to have had a doubt. The truth of Christianity is as much a starting-point with him as the fact of existence. This treatise is founded on the text of the three witnesses. The testimony of the Father was made to Jesus—'This is my beloved Son.' The testimony of the Son is what Jesus testified of Himself. That of the Holy Ghost is the evidence of miracles. Then follow the three witnesses on earth. The text is received

* Vol. i. p. 126.

† Vol. i. p. 102.

CHAP. VIII.

as genuine, though Patrick knew that in many MSS. it was not found. The first witness on earth corresponds to the third in heaven. The second witness is the water, which may be baptism, or a pure life, or a great many other things. The third witness is the blood, or the testimony of suffering.

Bishop Fowler.

Edward Fowler had been educated at Oxford, but he entirely agreed with the most advanced Cambridge theologians.* He wrote a defence of the Platonists, which he called 'A Free Discourse between Two Intimate Friends.' It took the form of a dialogue, and professed to give a true representation of 'the principles and practices of certain moderate divines of the Church of England greatly misunderstood.' They are spoken of in the dialogue as 'the persons with the long name.' That name was Latitudinarian. It was given in reproach, and popularly conveyed the meaning that the divines of that school were not too strict either in the belief of Christianity or in the practice of morality. Before the dialogue closes, it is shown that they adhere firmly to all the essentials of Christianity, but that on minor questions of speculative doctrine, Church government, and modes of worship, they 'persuade men to peace and moderation.'

The 'two friends' in the dialogue are Philalethes and Theophilus. They are introduced as mutually deploring the sad state of the Church, the 'prodigious heights' to which

* In the account of the meeting of the London clergy to deliberate about reading King James's Declaration of Indulgence, Macaulay says: 'The general feeling of the assembly seemed to be that it was on the whole advisable to obey the Order in Council. The dispute began to wax warm, and might have produced fatal consequences, if it had not been brought to a close by the firmness and wisdom of Dr. Edward Fowler, Vicar of St. Giles', Cripplegate, one of a small but remarkable class of divines, who united that love of civil liberty which belonged to the school of Calvin with the theology of the school of Arminius. Standing up, Fowler spoke thus: "I must be plain. The question is so simple that argument can throw no new light upon it, and can only beget heat. Let every man say Yes or No. But I cannot consent to be bound by the vote of the majority. I shall be sorry to cause a breach of unity. But this Declaration I cannot in conscience read." Tillotson, Patrick, Sherlock, and Stillingfleet, declared that they were of the same mind. The majority yielded to the authority of a minority so respectable. A resolution by which all present pledged themselves to one another not to read the declaration was then drawn up; Patrick was the first who set his hand to it; Fowler was the second. The paper was sent round the city, and was speedily subscribed by eighty-four incumbents.' —*History of England*, vol. ii. p. 349.

ur feuds have grown in matters of religion,' and the aver- ›n of all parties to entertain thoughts of 'peace and ac- ›mmodation.' The moderate men are described as beaten ı both sides. They laboured for peace, but High Church- en and Puritans made themselves ready for battle. Theo- ıilus wonders that any who profess Christianity should dge hardly of those who are called Latitudinarians. They ,d established, with unequalled success, the great principle ıich is the foundation of all religion—the principle that ›ral good and evil are so in themselves eternally and un- ɛerably. They had overthrown the doctrine of Hobbes, ıich made moral righteousness to have its foundation in e laws of the magistrate, and they had shown that the eat design of the Gospel is 'to make men good, not to ɔoxicate their brains with notions, or to furnish their nds with a system of opinions.' 'I have myself been,' ıeophilus again says, 'as constant a hearer of them as any ın, but never was my judgment more convinced, my will rsuaded, nor my affections wrought upon by any sermons an by theirs. I found that in their discourses generally ey handled those subjects that were weightiest and of most cessary importance. I mean such as have the greatest ɨpect unto reformation of men's lives and purification of ɛir souls. Nor had I ever so lively an idea of the Divine ture, which is the most powerful incentive to obedience the Divine will, nor so clear a sense of the excellency of ɜ Christian religion, the reasonableness of its precepts, › nobleness and generosity of its design, and its admirable ıess for the accomplishment of it, as, through the blessing God, I have gained by the hearing of these men.'

On the Latitudinarians.

Christianity is described as summed up by Jesus in the 'e of God and the love of man. That these are rational ɛcepts is granted by all rational creatures. The first is dent, as soon as we know that God is a Being of abso- e perfection, and the second is a self-evident principle in ›rals. It was recognized by the Pagans, as expressed ɣatively by Severus:—'Quod tibi fieri non vis, alteri ne ɛeris.' It is found again in the form which Jesus most nmended, love even to the unthankful and the evil. That ought to love our enemies every schoolboy knows who

The Christianity of Christ.

CHAP. VIII.

has read Cicero 'De Officiis.' Plato introduces Socrat saying, that 'An injury by no means is to be done, nor m it be repaid to him that hath done an injury.' Cato say 'If an ass kick me, shall I kick him again?' which certain means that on one class of people at least we are not to se revenge. Origen says that a man who had destroyed one Lycurgus' eyes was delivered up to him, but Lycurgus w so far from seeking to revenge the injury, that he nev ceased to give the man good advice till he also became philosopher. It is mentioned by Origen that an enem once said to Zeno, 'Let me perish if I do thee not a mi chief;' to which Zeno answered, 'And let me perish if I d not reconcile thee to me.'

Christianity rational.

The whole spirit of Christianity, as well as its precept is declared to be rational. It is in perfect harmony wi the spirit of the wise men of the Pagan world. They ha always set a higher value on good deeds than on me external worship, estimating the love of God or goo men more than a multitude of burnt-offerings. Hierocle speaking of the love of God, says, 'With this everythi is pleasing to God, but without this nothing.' He intr duces Apollo saying to a wicked man who had offered hecatomb, 'More agreeable to me is the barley-cake of po Hermion.' Philalethes asks if what has been said does n tend to disparage the Gospel, to make it, except in one two precepts, the same with mere natural religion. The philus answers, 'I would rather impose an eternal silence upon my tongue, and pluck it out by the roots too, tha once utter a syllable to such a mischievous purpose. But I am so far from being conscious to myself that what hath been said doth tend to the debasing of religion, that I know it highly conduceth to its commendation.' The Gospel is said to differ from natural religion. It has things to be known as well as things to be done. And it has points of mere belief which yet have an influence on practice. To revelation we owe many promises and many declarations of God's love to men. The Gospel contains all the duties of natural religion. It presents clearly and in a definite form all the excellent precepts that lie thinly scattered in the Pagan books. We have placed before our eyes

ne duties which those who lived without the Gospel could nly discover by long labour and great exercise of the easoning faculty. The Gospel, moreover, gives helps to he performance of duty. It presents strong motives and ersuasive arguments, as the inconceivable love of God and he gift of His Son, who took our nature, and made an expia- ory sacrifice for lost sinners. It gives us the example of hrist's life, His declarations of pardon, and His proffers f grace to assist us in well-doing. All that is required is uitable to our rational faculties, and this is to the com- nendation of the Gospel more than if its precepts were erfectly new and the reasonableness of them not evident o all.

The Latitudinarians and doctrine.

Theophilus admits that there are in Christianity certain octrines to be believed. Philalethes says he has heard hat the Latitudinarian divines endeavour to bring down ven the most mysterious of these to the shallow capa- ities of men. Theophilus answers, that this is partly ue and partly false. They have proved that all points of iere belief are reasonable, that is, consistent with reason. Ve have no temptation to disbelieve any of them, because f their contrariety to the innate and natural notions of our inds. Our assent is not required to contradictions. The ospel reveals things which reason could not have dis- overed, but in these things there is nothing opposed to eason. In the same way there are many things in nature hich we know to exist, but do not know how they exist. heophilus at first denies that the Latitudinarians ever said hat the mysteries of faith are consistent with reason. ut Philalethes quotes some passages which declare the spe- ulative doctrines of Christianity to be not only consistent with eason, but very suitable to its dictates. Theophilus then dmits this to be true as to some of the most important uestions. The heathen, he says, had some idea of immor- ality. Justin Martyr thought it probable that Plato be- ieved in the resurrection of the body. It was, however, he Gospel which brought life and immortality to light, hat is, which gave mankind a full satisfaction in that article f faith. Even the doctrine of the Trinity, 'as to the sub- tance of it, was embraced by the Pythagoreans and Pla-

CHAP. VIII.

tonists.' From the sacrifices of the heathen it is inferre that they must have had some idea of the doctrine of recor ciliation to God, through the sacrifice of Christ. At its firs institution Christianity, according to Theophilus, had onl few mysteries; but after two or three centuries, it was a mystery together. Erasmus says, that in the time of th Nicene Council it was 'a matter of great wit and cunnin to be a Christian.' But in the Apostolic times Christianit was so plain that St. Paul said, 'If our Gospel be hid, i is hid to them that are lost.' The practical conclusion o the dialogue is, that the doors of the Church should be se 'wider open,'—that 'all disputed and uncertain doctrines be removed from our formularies,—and 'that there b nothing in our ecclesiastical constitution that may give an plausible pretence for separation or nonconformity.' This Theophilus says, was the spirit of Jesus, who, were He no on earth, would certainly be called a Latitudinarian.

The 'Design of Christianity.'

Fowler also wrote a treatise on 'The Design of Chris tianity,' which was answered by John Bunyan,* who foun it made up of three ingredients,—'Popery, Socinianism and Quakerism.' He wrote another, called 'A Discours of the Descent of the Man Christ Jesus from Heaven.' I this he said that the man Jesus was the Logos who had been eternally with the Father, who appeared to Lot and Abraham, afterwards to Moses, and last of all came forth fron the Father to dwell with men; and when He had finishe His work He ascended again to His Father. The eterna Logos was the human soul of Christ. Another tract was published after Fowler's death, called 'Certain Propositions by which the Doctrine of the Trinity is so explained in the Ancient Fathers as to speak it not contradictory to Natural Reason.' The Bishop says that the Father is the only self-existent One. The Son and Holy Ghost are *from* the Father, as the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds both declare. It is, therefore, a contradiction to say that the second and third persons are self-existent. The Father alone is the only true God, the first Original of all things, the only Good. In this highest sense the Godhead is one numerically. It is, however, no contradiction to say that from the

* Fowler was at this time vicar of Northill, in Bedfordshire.

irst Original proceeded other beings with all perfections except self-existence. The Son and the Holy Ghost have a right to the name of God in a sense next to that in which it is appropriated to the Father. They were not created; they emanated, as light emanates from the sun, and this emanation was eternal. This is shown to be contrary to Arianism, for the Arians say that there was a time when the Word was not. It is also contrary to Socinianism, for Socinians say that the Word was created. The unity of the Trinity is an inseparable union in nature and in will. This view of the Trinity is said to be that of the Nicene Creed, but older than the Council of Nice. It is said to have the 'fewest difficulties, and to be incomparably most agreeable to the Holy Scripture.'

Bishop Stillingfleet.

Edward Stillingfleet had also been educated at Cambridge. In 1648 he was admitted a scholar of St. John's. We have no record of his mental history. But it was impossible that he could have escaped the influence of the Platonists. His mind developed early, but it soon reached maturity and ceased to make progress. In 1659 Stillingfleet was appointed to the Rectory of Sutton, in Cambridgeshire. He did not scruple to accept a living at a time when Episcopacy was proscribed; but, unlike Tillotson, Patrick, and some other eminent Churchmen of the Restoration, he had never been in any sense a Presbyterian. Before entering on the duties of his parish, he received ordination from Dr. Brownrig, the ejected Bishop of Exeter.

Stillingfleet's life was spent in controversy. The biography prefixed to the collected edition of his works consists of little more than an account of the books he wrote, and the circumstances of his writing them. At the age of twenty-three he published his 'Irenicum, A Weapon Salve for the Church's Wounds.' In this work he professed, as the rest of the title says, to discuss and examine the divine right of particular forms of church government. He was to examine them 'according to the principles of the law of nature, the positive laws of God, the practice of the Apostles, the primitive Church, and the Reformed divines.' The object of this work was to unite all parties in one national Church, on the principle that there was no system

'The Irenicum.'

CHAP. VIII.

of church government in the New Testament. In the preface Stillingfleet says that it had become the custom of all parties to give the outward form of the Church glorious names. They called it 'the undoubted practice of the Apostles, the discipline of Christ, the order of the Gospel,' and each party spoke as if none could be saved but those who had embarked in their ship. He had no doubt of the antiquity and the conveniency of the Episcopal form, but he did not hold it necessary to the constitution of a church. His argument was chiefly addressed to those of the Presbyterians who supposed the Presbyterian discipline of divine origin. He wished the constitution of the Church to depend entirely on holding the essential doctrines and performing the necessary duties of Christianity. These were, he said, the sole conditions of communion that had been made by Christ. The bond of unity was to be love and affection, and not a bare conformity of practice and opinion. It is maintained that the early Church showed great toleration towards different parties within its communion. It was broad and comprehensive, admitting diverse rites and various opinions among its ministers and members. This latitude was first opposed by the sects. The Church continued moderate and catholic till Arians, Donatists, and Circumcelliones declared that they alone were the Church. The catholicity of the primitive Church was to be a basis for the reconstruction of the Church of England. Its foundation was not to be laid on any supposed form of divinely appointed government, but in such a rational constitution as circumstances required.

The primitive Church a broad Church.

To prepare the minds of all parties for union in a broad Church, Stillingfleet had to establish some general principles. The fact that a divine origin was claimed for widely different forms of church government was held a sufficient proof that Christ had never intended one uniform government for all times and places. We do not know with any certainty what form of government prevailed in the primitive Church, and if we did, it would not follow that the same form should be adopted by us. Matters of polity are left to the ordinary reason of the Christian community. Different forms of church government were said to be of divine origin, in

No church polity in the New Testament.

the sense that they are derived from the light of reason and the general principles of the word of God. The reason of government is divine, and therefore a rational form may be called divine. 'Two things,' says Stillingfleet, 'I conceive are of an unalterable divine right. First, that there be a society and joining together of men for the worship of God. Secondly, that this society be governed, preserved, and maintained in a most convenient manner.'* A society for worship is shown to be a dictate of reason, arising from the social nature of man being capable of improvement by religion. Reason teaches that in this society there must be governors. But as the unity of the Church depends on communion, and not on opinions, the governors should regard as liable to censure those only who break the peace of the Church. We should tolerate those who differ from us, so long as their differences are not fundamental. On the same principle we should conform to the Church of the nation, so long as conformity is not really sinful. We separated from the Church of Rome because of her idolatry and superstition. To remain in communion with her was found to be impossible, without partaking of her sins. We were commanded not only to profess that all the doctrines of that Church were not erroneous, but that they were certain and necessary truths.

Origin and development of church government.

In the first ages of the Church, when believers were few, it is admitted that a congregation may have had no rulers except its pastor and deacons. But when the Church enlarged, and became co-extensive with a whole nation, a different form of government may have been not only lawful, but necessary. The ecclesiastical polity of the Jews was copied from their civil government. If in this sense, Christ is to be faithful over His house as Moses was, then the government of every national Church should be a copy of the civil government of that nation. All the standing rules of polity, as, for instance, the charges to Timothy and Titus, are declared to be equally applicable to different forms of government. Hooker is quoted as having made it his great argument against the Puritans, that there was no church polity in the New Testament. The

* P. 27, ed. 1662.

CHAP. VIII.

superiority of the twelve Apostles over the seventy disciples is called a myth, and the testimony of the first ages concerning government is pronounced very uncertain. It is supposed to have been a custom that where a church was founded by an Apostle or an Evangelist, tradition made the founder the bishop of that place. It is doubted if the Apostles always established the same government in every church. Irenæus calls presbyters bishops. On the other hand, there is no evidence of any presbyters besides those who were ordained presbyters of cities. The presbyters of whom St. Paul speaks in his Epistle to Timothy were also bishops in the Scriptural sense, and cannot by any kind of reasoning be identified with lay elders. Augustine speaks of hundreds of bishops flocking to one council. Sozomen says that the very villages had bishops. Cranmer and other bishops of his time, both Protestant and Catholic, maintained that bishops and presbyters were but one order. To the same effect many other divines of the Church of England are quoted in the 'Irenicum,' and among them Francis Mason, the great advocate of the validity of English orders, who also made 'an excellent defence of the ordination of ministers beyond the seas.'*

The 'Origines Sacræ.'

Stillingfleet's 'Irenicum' was followed not long after by the 'Origines Sacræ,' which is generally reckoned his greatest work. It is called 'A Rational Account of the Grounds of the Christian Faith as to the Truth and Divine Authority of the Scriptures and the matters therein contained.' In the beginning of this work we have some traces of the influence of Stillingfleet's Cambridge education. He is full of Plato, and full of reason. He fortifies the foundation of his arguments by the precedents of the Alexandrian

* The 'Irenicum' is latitudinarian, but with a leaning sometimes to the Puritan side. Speaking of the early Church, Stillingfleet says, 'Public prayers were not then looked on as the more principal end of Christian assemblies than preaching, nor consequently that it was the more principal office of stewards of the mysteries of God to read the public prayers of the Church than to preach in season and out of season. And is it not a great pity two such excellent duties should ever be set at variance, much less one so preferred before the other that the one must be esteemed as Sarah and the other almost undergo the hardship of Hagar, to be looked on as the bondwoman of the synagogue, and to be turned out of doors? Praying and preaching be the Jachin and Boaz of the temple, like Rachel and Leah, both which built up the house of Israel; but though Rachel be fair and beautiful, yet Leah is the more fruitful' (p. 333).

Fathers. They believed in the capacity of man to know truth. They believed that there was truth in philosophy; and that all truth to be received must commend itself to the inner faculty by which truth is discerned. Plato's saying is endorsed, that all knowledge is remembrance. In its primitive state, the mind of man had conceptions or notions of things which were lost in the shipwreck of human nature. The knowledge which we now acquire is but 'the gathering of some scattered fragments of what was once one entire fabric, and the recovery of some precious jewels.' The original perfection of knowledge is found in the fact recorded of Adam, that he gave names to all beasts of the field. Plato says that 'the imposition of names on things belongs not to every one, but only to him that hath a fair prospect into their several natures.'* These conceptions or notions were the inward senses of the soul. When revelation came, 'it brought nothing,' Stillingfleet says, 'contrary to the principles of human nature, but did only rectify the depravations of it, and clearly shew more that way which they had long been ignorantly seeking after.'† This was recognized by St. Paul when he preached to the Athenians concerning the altar to the Unknown God. The primitive Christians made use of what the heathen writers had said concerning the divine nature and the immortality of the soul. They showed that Christianity did not overturn the great principles that were received by all that had a name for reason.

Scripture histories defended.

But the chief object of the 'Origines Sacræ' was to defend the credibility of the Scripture histories. These were said not to be in harmony with the records of profane history. But Stillingfleet maintained that the pagan histories were not to be trusted. The Greeks had no letters before Cadmus, and he with his company are supposed to be the Canaanites that fled from Joshua. All the Greek histories are reckoned fabulous till long after the first Olympiad. Philo Byblius, who translated Sanchoniathon, says that the Phœnicians were the most ancient of all the barbarians, and that other nations derived their theology from them. Porphyry made great use of Sanchoniathon against Christianity;

* 'Origines Sacræ,' ed. 1666, p. 4. † *Ib.* p. 9.

CHAP. VIII.

but he was obliged to admit that Sanchoniathon was younger than Moses, though he had supposed him older than the Trojan war. Among the Chaldeans, Manetho and Berosus were not older than Ptolemy Philadelphus, in whose time the Old Testament was translated into Greek. The Greeks are often supposed to have had a better account of ancient history than other nations; but the Greeks had no histories till but a little time before Cyrus and Cambyses. Many Greek historians are to us merely names: we know nothing of their books. The epochs of heathen chronology are pronounced uncertain, and the histories full of contradictions, the same historians even contradicting themselves. The contrary is affirmed of the histories in the Scriptures. It is maintained that for their genuineness and authenticity we have as much certainty as we can have for things that happened so many centuries ago. This certainty is supposed to be sufficient, and on it Stillingfleet erects his arguments for the divine mission of Moses and Jesus.

We shall best learn Stillingfleet's position as to the evidences from the ground he occupied in the Roman Catholic controversy. To this controversy we can trace historically the genesis of Deism. But the seeds were sown long before Stillingfleet undertook the refutation of Papal doctrine. In Laud's conference with Fisher the Jesuit, the Archbishop was pressed to answer the question how he knew the Scriptures to be the word of God without the authority of an infallible Church. Laud expressed his unwillingness to enter on this question, because 'of the danger of men's being disputed into infidelity by the circle between Scripture and tradition.' He said that it was not a question which should be raised among Christians; yet, rather than have the worst of the argument, he entered upon it, to show that the Protestant ground of faith was at least as good as the Catholic. Laud's arguments we have already recorded.* They were the ordinary Protestant arguments, accompanied by some peculiar views of tradition, which neither made them stronger nor weaker. Roman Catholic controversialists have always seen that Protestants, who reject the infallible authority of the present Church, have a difficulty

The genesis of Deism.

* See Vol. I. p. 170.

in maintaining infallible Scriptures, that is, in proving that they are the word of God. On both sides it was supposed that Christianity could not stand if both the Church and the Bible were admitted to be fallible. The Roman Catholic, consequently, has always been ready to reduce the Protestant to the alternative of the Church or Deism. Laud mentioned several ways by which we know the Scriptures to be the word of God; but he felt that each was insufficient by itself, and so he rested his cause on the combination of them all together. In 1663, long after Laud was dead, a Roman Catholic author wrote a book called 'Labyrinthus Cantuariensis, or Dr. Laud's Labyrinth.'* The Archbishop's book was severely dealt with. It was described as full of 'abstruse turnings,' 'ambiguous wanderings,' 'intricate meanders,' and like the 'pestiferous works of all heretical authors.' The Bishop of London, Humphrey Henchman, asked Stillingfleet to answer the 'Labyrinthus,' which he did in a treatise called 'A Rational Account of the Grounds of the Protestant Religion.' He pretends to no more than moral certainty for the truth of Christianity, and he shows that more than moral certainty the Roman Catholic cannot give for his infallible Church. Now if we have Christianity on moral certainty, it is surely, he argues, a 'labyrinth' to seek to come by it in the way of an infallible Church, for which nothing more than moral certainty can be adduced. We are, then, Protestants by the same reason that we are Christians. If we have only a 'moral assurance,' we should not pretend to more than we really have. It is in this way Stillingfleet says that Roman Catholics take away the real grounds of faith. They rest Christianity on an infallible Church, which promises absolute certainty, while the infallibility of the Church itself is only a probability, for which nothing more than a moral certainty can be alleged.

Dr. Laud's 'Labyrinth;' or how do we know the Scriptures to be divine without the infallible Church?

When Stillingfleet had in this way answered 'the Romanist's way of resolving faith,' he went on to the question which had been discussed by Laud. He does not profess to do more than vindicate the arguments of the Archbishop. Protestants know the Scriptures to be the word of God in various ways, and all these ways taken together amount to

Laud defended.

* It professed to have been published in Paris in 1559.

CHAP. VIII.

a moral certainty sufficient to justify the faith of rational men. 'I doubt not,' Stillingfleet says to one of his adversaries, 'but to make it evident that the way taken by the most judicious and considerative Protestants is as satisfactory and reasonable as I have already made it appear that yours is unreasonable and ridiculous.'*

The question is, what evidence have we that the Christian revelation really comes from God? The answer is, that the evidence is a number of probabilities. Our belief does not rest on an immediate divine testimony. It is a rational or discursive act of the mind. Faith is sometimes resolved into the testimony of the Spirit, that is to say, the operation of the Spirit produces saving faith. But that, Stillingfleet says, is not the question with which he has to deal. That faith gives no account why anything is believed. It only points to the efficient cause. When we speak of resolving faith, we mean marking out the cause which is the ground of our assent. For different acts of faith there must then be different resolutions. We must give reasons why we believe what is contained in the Scriptures to be true, why we believe their doctrine divine, and the books themselves a divine revelation. For these Stillingfleet brings forward the usual arguments concerning the writers, the time when they wrote, their means of knowing the truth of the events, their suffering in attestation of what they said, and their books being generally received as genuine and authentic by their contemporaries, whether Jews, Christians, or Pagans. This is all the evidence of which the subject is capable, and why, he says, should we ask for more? He repeats the argument from miracles in the form in which it was put by Tillotson. Because of the miracles which Jesus wrought, we believe His doctrine to be divine. This evidence was sufficient to those who saw the miracles, and therefore it ought to be sufficient to us. What their senses testified to them tradition testifies to us. If it is said that tradition is not absolute certainty, the answer is neither was the evidence of the senses. They might have been deceived. In both cases there is simply credibility, which is a sufficient foundation for assent. The grounds of all

Faith resolved into probabilities which amount to 'moral certainty.'

* 'Works,' ed. 1709, vol. v. p. 195.

eligion are capable of no more assurance than that of noral certainty. We believe that there is a God; we be-ieve that the soul is immortal; but absolute certainty for ;ither we have none. Credibility involves the obligation of ›elief; and when there is an obligation to believe, we may 'est assured that the matter is infallibly true. If moral :ertainty is not sufficient, then there is a strange want of a ›rovision for faith. This general conviction of the providence ›f God is used also as an argument that the Scriptures vhich convey to us the Christian revelation are essentially rue. Whether they were written by immediate suggestion ›f the Spirit of God, or whether the writers were left in nany things to their natural knowledge is not regarded as ffecting the argument. Stillingfleet thinks that in mere ıistorical passages they did not require assistance; and 'rom such doubts as that in the sixth of St. John, whe-her the rowing was twenty-five furlongs or thirty, he thinks hey did not receive it.

When Tillotson was on his death-bed, he recommended o the queen Thomas Tenison as his successor in the See of Canterbury. Tenison had been made Bishop of Lincoln in 1691. We have already spoken of his reply to Hobbes, vhich was founded on the principles of eternal morality, vhich he had learned from Cudworth, at Cambridge. This vas his first and best effort in literature. As Vicar of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, he had become a great preacher nd an earnest worker in the ordinary duties of a parish minister. In the time of James he took an important part in the great controversy with the Roman Catholics. The esoluteness with which the clergy met the propagandists ›f the king's creed must ever stamp the Church of England ıs the most Protestant Church in the world. They were not content with writing books, but they met the Jesuits face to face both in public and private, never ceasing to persuade every man that the Reformation in England was the restoration of the pure gospel of Jesus Christ.

Archbishop Tenison.

We have accounts of many of these meetings or con-ferences, as they were called, but one which Tenison held may indicate their general character. Andrew Pulton, a Jesuit father at the Savoy, had converted a country

CHAP. VIII.

youth who was an apprentice in Tenison's parish. The Jesuit had told the boy that Luther was persuaded by the devil not to go to mass, and that this was the beginning of the Reformation. After his conversion, the boy had become an 'intolerable liar,' and, to re-convert him, Tenison held a conference with Pulton. After various preliminaries, Tenison objected to some persons present, especially a pervert, who had expressed in a coffeehouse great pity for St. Martin's parish being under one man when it was capable of maintaining thirty friars, to which Tenison had answered that he must not count his friars until they were hatched. Pulton asked Tenison to prove that the Protestants had a Bible. Tenison asked for a Bible, and then he would prove it. Pulton answered, that if he had a Bible he could not prove that he had one. The Bible must be received on the authority of the Church. That authority must be infallible, otherwise we have no certainty that the Bible is what we believe it to be. After a long digression about the devil appearing to Luther, Tenison said that whatever good arguments Roman Catholics had for believing the Bible, Protestants had the same. Then Pulton went on as to the necessity of 'hearing the Church.' After several desultory discussions on various points, the disputants landed in some quotations from Ambrose, Cyril, and Justin Martyr. To settle the genuineness, accuracy, and, if possible, the meaning of these quotations, the conference was postponed. Tenison gave Pulton a lecture for tampering with the religion of Protestant children, and the Jesuit said that he was anxious for their 'eternal salvation.' The boy was admonished to give up lying. He had never been a very good youth, but since his secret visits to the Jesuits' chapel he had evidently taken a turn for the worse. The controversy was continued in writing, but Pulton being unable to write English correctly, asked Tenison to write in Latin.

Conference with Pulton.

Tenison's theology is said to have been Latitudinarian, and there is nothing in any of his few published writings which shows the contrary. He was the son of a clergyman who had sacrificed his living in the time of the Commonwealth, and he had himself hesitated to take orders until the restoration of the bishops under Charles. But Tenison had

as little of the bigoted Churchman as of the ardent Puritan. His sermons are full of practical religion, rarely touching on disputed doctrines, and chiefly remarkable for clearness and simplicity. His life was like his sermons. He was zealous in all charitable works, providing for the poor, establishing schools and libraries, and supporting societies for the reformation of manners. The parish of Lambeth has memorials of the goodness of Thomas Tenison where no trace can be found of any other occupant of the See of Canterbury. He realized the doctrine of his own excellent sermon, 'preached before their Majesties at Whitehall,' on 'Doing Good to Posterity.'

Tenison's charity.

Gilbert Burnet was the first bishop appointed by King William. A few days after his accession, the diocese of Salisbury was vacant through the death of Seth Ward. The elevation of Burnet to the episcopate was the occasion of universal indignation. Sancroft refused to consecrate, till, compelled by the civil power, he did it by means of his suffragans. Burnet was never a favourite with the English clergy. They hate his memory even to this day. His Latitudinarianism is the reason usually assigned. But this in itself was not the cause. He had been one of the most ardent promoters of the Revolution, and one of the most determined enemies of James. This was enough for many even of those who submitted to the oaths, but there was more than even this. Burnet had a Scotchman's natural contempt for the intellect of the English clergy, and he did not scruple to let them know it.

Gilbert Burnet.

There is nothing in Burnet's theology which entitles him to be classed with the Latitudinarians. He is not a Calvinist, but in all other respects he accepts the theology of the Reformers as set forth in the standards of the Church. In his Exposition of the Articles he has the candour to admit that Article XVII. was intended to express the doctrine of Augustine, and that this doctrine pervades the rest of the Articles. He is zealous beyond measure to defend the sacrifice on the cross as a proper substitution or satisfaction for the sins of men. Christ died, he says, in the place of humanity. He bore the punishment due to the whole human race. The universality of the substitution is clearly taught

On Christ's satisfaction for sin.

CHAP. VIII.

in Article XXXI., so that in this, at least, Burnet had th authority of the Church. He sets aside, with great freedor and decision, the scholastic ideas that God could not forgiv without satisfaction.* He rejects, too, the legal idea o justification, identifying justification simply with a state o acceptance. All the hard reasoning drawn from the divin attributes about the necessity of substitution is set aside but the doctrine itself is received. It is a fact that Chris 'died to expiate sin.' In the same way Burnet rejects al the rigid ideas of imputing righteousness on condition o mere faith. He makes the forgiveness of sin to be dependen on the obedience of the believer. On this ground he esti mates at little value a death-bed repentance. The fruit of new life is supposed necessary to forgiveness. The objec- tions to this theology are simply the objections to the schem of Arminius, who wished to retain the system of Calvi without its difficulties. It supposes that the Divine Beinş was appeased in order that conditions of forgiveness migh be proposed to the human race. It supposes also tha after the penalty of the sins of the world had been borne by Christ, the penalty of sin was again laid on the sinner i he did not believe and repent.

On Episcopacy.

Burnet regarded Episcopacy as of divine origin. He urge the usual arguments for conformity, and was not behind an of the divines of his time in the warfare against the Churcl of Rome. In a sermon on a fast-day appointed for imploring the divine blessing on the war with France, he spoke of the war as undertaken in the cause of Protestantism. Though believing in the divine origin of Episcopacy, he did not, however, unchurch the Reformed Churches which had nc bishops. He wrote a book to persuade the Presbyterians in Scotland to embrace Episcopacy, but he condemned the practice introduced after the Restoration of requiring the Presbyterian ministers to be re-ordained. Before that time he testifies that there was no such custom among the Scotch bishops. He prayed for the success of the English arms in the French war, because on it depended the union of the foreign churches with the Church of England.

As to the sacraments, Burnet is clear for regeneration in

* 'Four Discourses to the Clergy of Sarum,' p. 134.

aptism, and a special divine favour communicated in the CHAP. VIII.
ɔception of the Lord's Supper. In baptism, he says, we
re made the children of God not merely in the sense of
doption, but we are 'grafted into Christ and made mem-
ɔrs of His body; we are born again, and have a new nature
ɔrmed in us.'* The benefit of baptism is further described On baptism.
s our being reconciled to God, so that God loves us, pities
s, provides for us, and watches over us as a father.† This
; very strong, but, like many other strong things said
y writers of Burnet's school, it turns out in the end to
ıcan very little. The benefits of baptism are made to
epend on a supposed admission to a covenant by baptism,
ıd they are not really ours until our part of the covenant
ıs been performed. 'Baptism,' he says, 'is a covenant by
hich the parties are equally bound to one another; and
nless we stand to and make good the vow of baptism, we
ave no claim to the rights conveyed to us by it.'‡ It is
ɔmmon in theology, though scarcely within the limits of
ɔcurate speech, to call that a 'new nature' which consists
nly in benefits to be realized on the performance of certain
ɔnditions. Burnet's words on the other sacrament are
ɔre guarded. His rejection of the real presence is decided.
he benefit in the eucharist he describes as resulting from On the eucha-
ght preparation and obedience to the command of Jesus rist.
celebrate this supper in remembrance of Him. Burnet
as so far a Latitudinarian as to wish the Athanasian Creed
ut of the Liturgy; but he was so far orthodox as to write
n answer to Bishop Croft on 'Naked Truth.' In this
nswer he argues for the necessity of creeds. As new here-
es arise, it is necessary for the Church to give new defini-
ɔns or statements of the orthodox faith. It is not admitted
ıat the Arian, as some said, differed from the Athanasian
y a trifling iota. The question really was, if, in worshiping
esus Christ, we worship God the Creator of all things, or
ıerely one that was himself created.§

* 'Explanation of the Church Cate-
hism,' p. 7.
† *Ibid.* p. 10.
‡ *Ibid.* p. 12; and 'Exposition of
XXIX. Articles,' pp. 303–4.
§ The Church of England has no
ıse to be ashamed of Bishop Bur-
net. But few bishops have done so
much solid ordinary church work as
he did. Macaulay says, 'When he
died, there was no corner of his dio-
cese in which the people had not had
seven or eight opportunities of re-
ceiving his instructions and asking for

CHAP. VIII.

Bishop Moore.

Among the liberal bishops we should not omit Jo. Moore, Rector of St. Andrew's, Holborn, who was appoint to Norwich in 1691,* and afterwards transferred to El Moore published nothing, but after his death two volumes his sermons were edited by his chaplain, Dr. Samuel Clark These sermons have the usual imperfections of sermons n intended for publication, but they bear sufficient testimon to the author's learning and his agreement with the ration churchmen of his day. 'Godliness' the Bishop describes 'a a comprehension of all moral virtues. It takes in not onl acts of religion towards God, but of righteousness towar our neighbours, and of sobriety with respect to ourselves He adds that 'it is a walking suitably to that nature and that reason which God has given us, and for God's sake which notion of godliness being admitted, it cannot possibl be thought an arbitrary thing, but must be eternal and im mutable, as the nature of mankind, or rather as God is, who contrived that nature.' † ‡

his advice. The worst weather, the worst roads did not prevent him from discharging these duties. On one occasion, when the floods were out, he exposed his life to imminent risk, rather than disappoint a rural congregation which was in expectation of a discourse from the Bishop. The poverty of the inferior clergy was a constant cause of uneasiness to his kind and generous heart. He was indefatigable and at length successful in his attempts to obtain for them from the Crown that grant which is known by the name of Queen Anne's Bounty. He was specially careful when he travelled through his diocese to lay no burden on them. Instead of requiring them to entertain him, he entertained them. He always fixed his head-quarters at a market-town, kept a table there, and, by his decent hospitality and munificent charities, tried to conciliate those who were prejudiced against his doctrines. When he bestowed a poor benefice, and he had many such to bestow, his practice was to add out of his own purse twenty pounds a year to the income. Ten promising young men, to each of whom he allowed thirty pounds a year, studied divinity under his own eye in the close of Salisbury. He had several children, but he di not think of hoarding for them. Their mother had brought them a good fortune; with that he always said the must be content. He would not fo their sakes be guilty of the crime of raising an estate out of revenue sacred to charity and piety. Suc merits as these will, in the judgment of wise and candid men, appear fully to atone for every offence which can be justly imputed to him.'—*History of England*, vol. iii. p. 79.

* Sharp, Moore, Cumberland, Fowler were consecrated together at Bow Church, July 5, 1691. Samuel Clarke preached the consecration sermon.

† Vol. i. p. 17.

‡ Samuel Clarke says that the world had reason to expect from Bishop Moore 'many excellent and useful works, had not his continued application to the duties of his episcopal function, his perpetual readiness to collect, with much time and care, out of his immense library, materials for learned men who were writing upon all sorts of useful subjects, and his unwearied pains in relieving both the temporal and spiritual wants of the poor, who perpetually applied to him from all parts, left him little, very little time for his own private studies.'

CHAP. VIII.

Bishop Grove.

When Patrick was translated to Ely in 1691, he was succeeded at Chichester by Dr. Robert Grove, Prebendary of St. Paul's. Grove had taken a part in the Roman Catholic controversy, and had written the chief treatise in the volume that was intended to restore Dissenters to Conformity. He had also defended the position of the liberal divines of the Church of England against William Jenkyn, one of the ejected ministers of 1662. Jenkyn represented the old High Presbyterians that came in with the Long Parliament. He had been imprisoned under Cromwell for his share in the Love Plot, and he had become celebrated as one of the adversaries of John Goodwin. To the old Presbyterians the liberal theology was as little agreeable as to Herbert Thorndike and the rigid Churchmen, though the leaders of the Nonconformists, as Baxter, Bates, and Howe, were not far behind the leaders of the Conformists. Jenkyn preached a funeral sermon for Dr. Lazarus Seaman. In that sermon he charged the clergy of the Church of England with departing from the 'Articles of Religion,' and bringing in a new gospel.* To this sermon Dr. Grove wrote an answer. He vindicated the liberal clergy, denying that they had departed from the doctrines of the Church, yet maintaining that by subscription they were not bound to every particular in the Articles.† Jenkyn ascribed to Dr. Seaman the discovery that all changes of government were due to divine Providence, and therefore all subjects ought to obey the power that rules. Dr. Grove showed that this was in substance the doctrine of Hobbes, the worship of 'Potentia Irresistibilis.' Jenkyn was vindicating submission to Cromwell, and Grove afterwards, in giving allegiance to William, adopted the doctrine which he now refutes.

Bishop Williams.

In 1696 John Williams succeeded Dr. Grove as Bishop of Chichester. Two years before this he had been Boyle lecturer, and had published discourses in defence of revela-

* Describing the new Arminian clergy, Jenkyn says, 'What a company of uncatechized upstarts do we now behold, venting as confidently their heretical notions in opposition to our famous English divines, as if Jewel, Whitaker, Davenant, Downam, Abbot, Ussher, etc., were by them to be degraded to schoolboys, and to sit at their feet to reach the blessings of their heads, yea, as if to the doctrine of the Church of England, *subversion* had been intended when subscription was performed.'—P. 55.

† P. 29.

CHAP. VIII. tion. His lectures formed the third series since the foundation of the lectureship. Richard Bentley had written 'The Confutation of Atheism,' and Bishop Kidder 'The Demonstration of the Messias.' Williams begins with what seems a very simple division of our knowledge of religion—the natural and the supernatural. The insufficiency of the first is the primary argument for the second. Inquiry and observation within the spheres of reason and nature do not give, Dr. Williams says, the satisfaction which we crave. But God at sundry times and in divers manners has revealed

On revelation. Himself. Revelation is defined as making known that which before was secret, and again as God making known His will over and above what He has made known by the light of nature and reason. Objects of religious knowledge are divided into three classes. The first consists of things knowable by the light of nature only, as the existence of God; the second, of things knowable only by revelation, as redemption by Jesus Christ; and the third of things partly known by nature and partly revealed, as the immortality of the soul. The possibility of revelation is shown from the capacity of one man to reveal his mind to another. If man has this capacity, much more has God. The general belief of antiquity in oracles and prophecies is an argument that men have always believed revelation to be possible. It is said to be given when some extraordinary occasion requires it. God inspired Adam, for being created at once he would have been at first perfectly ignorant without immediate revelation. How God would have continued to reveal Himself to Adam's posterity we do not know. If Adam had not sinned, supernatural revelation might have been unnecessary. But after the fall it was indispensable for his recovery. The promise of a Redeemer was made in Eden. This was the beginning of the Christian revelation, which was continued till the coming of Christ. Without supernatural inspiration, the human race would have degenerated to savages. But the lamp of revelation has continued to burn. We have every reason to believe that revelation has been given. The Christian religion is the only one that is worthy of God. If it is not true, there is no revelation given to man.

CHAP. VIII.

In the second lecture Dr. Williams treats of 'The Certainty of Divine Revelation.' From the evidence of its necessity he concludes its probability. There is provision in nature for all the desires implanted in the creature. It is surely not to be concluded that this desire for revelation is that alone for which there is no provision. This is something which God's goodness forbids us to suppose. Without revelation we should want that certainty which is necessary to give the mind satisfaction. The objection is anticipated from the Pagans having no revelation. It is shown that the fault is their own. God had used ordinary means to preserve among them the original revelation, but by their negligence and wickedness they sit in darkness and the shadow of death. As Adam and Eve were created in the full possession of matured faculties, they must have had the gift of speech immediately from God. It was a divine infusion, and so equivalent to revelation. Of the same kind as the gift of speech to our first parents are the 'common notions' or 'natural impressions' which we have independently of our reason. What Aristotle and Cicero called the natural or unwritten law, not instituted externally but infused into nature, Dr. Williams reckoned equivalent to revelation and called a natural proof of revelation. He shows from tradition that there have been inspired persons from the beginning of the world, that in all nations traces of revelation are to be found, and he maintains that all rites and customs not founded in reason are due to revelation. Such is the division of time into weeks of seven days and expiatory sacrifices. As these sacrifices could not have been dictated by reason, they must have been of divine institution. They were typical of the greater sacrifice. Supernatural proofs of revelation are the fulfilment of prophecy and the working of miracles. All these things, taken together, are said to yield unquestionable evidence that a revelation has been given. The consideration of them is preparatory to the discussion that we have a written revelation.

The certainty of revelation.

Several marks are set down by which the true revelation is distinguished from imitations. The subject matter must be something out of the road of nature and not discover-

Marks of the true revelation.

CHAP. VIII.

able by mere reason. It must be worthy of God and it must bear evidence that it is from God. It must be consonant to the principles of nature and to the ideas of mankind concerning good and evil. These are necessary characters, yet not in themselves sufficient to prove a revelation. It must have something peculiar to it and not in common with anything else. That the revelation in the Scriptures has this evidence is shown by three considerations. The first is that the persons to whom it was made had such evidence that they might as well have doubted the testimony of sense as that it was God Himself who taught them. We may not have had this experience ourselves, but we can understand it to be perfectly possible for God so to enlighten the understanding that the proof shall be as evident as that light proceeds from the sun. Revelation may be certain without a sign. Indeed the proper use of a sign is for those who receive revelation at second-hand. They must depend on the veracity, sincerity, and credibility of the persons who pretend to inspiration. They must inquire into the subject matter and the testimony. The persons must be men of probity, prudence, good understanding, and worthy of credit. Dr. Williams here refutes the doctrine of Spinoza, that the prophets had not a more perfect understanding than other men, but only a more vivid imagination. The subject matter must be for the advantage and happiness of mankind, such as teaches us what nature is insufficient to teach us, or such as assures us of the certainty of a life to come. A revelation which did not do this would be no revelation. When the course of nature is changed in attestation of a revelation it is then plainly the finger of God. But those who live in after ages, and receive this evidence of miracles only on testimony, must be content with the evidence suited to their circumstances. The evidence is sufficient if it proves that there were persons inspired, that miracles were wrought in confirmation of what they taught, that these persons wrote books recording their revelations and miracles, and that the books are the same which now go under their name. Of matters transacted so many centuries ago we can have only testimony, or what is called moral evidence.

Miracles not necessary for immediate revelation.

Dr. Williams goes on to prove the truth of the Scriptures. CHAP. VIII.
Different kinds of things, he says, have different kinds of evidence. That which is proper to facts is testimony. There may be collateral evidence, but history must be treated as history. From all that we know of the writers of the Scripture we may believe them to be even more reliable than any ancient writers. They lived near the time of the events which they record, and had the best means of information. What they record is credible and has the consent of mankind. Such is the account of the origin of the world, the formation of man, and the dispersion of nations. As to the objections of Spinoza concerning the uncertainty of the books, the copies, and the various readings, Dr. Williams says that they would invalidate all writings and, like the argument against motion, are not to be answered but despised. We are to distinguish between the matter and the books. They are capable of different proofs. The matter was revealed before it was written. The writing is only for its conveyance and preservation. The matter was confirmed by miracles, but not the books. It is shown to be divine by the application of the principles already laid down. It is worthy of God, and, as Origen said, 'it turned men who were immersed in wickedness to a life agreeable to reason.' The argument for the Scriptures rests in the last analysis on the providence of God. The same Divine Being who made known His will to mankind would take the best means for continuing and preserving it. Scripture being the only means of that kind, becomes a rule of faith, and is of sufficient authority to oblige us to receive it. That the books of the Scripture were written by inspired persons and received as such by the whole Church is said to be as well proved as anything can be so far distant from us as to time and space. But whether or not this evidence is sufficient is not further discussed. The several 'ways of revelation' are considered in another lecture. These are inspiration, visions, dreams, and voices. Inspiration is divided into natural, providential, and supernatural. The whole of revelation is regarded as a scheme of progression corresponding to the order of nature. Dr. Williams had not learned the distinction which marks off all

The truth of Scripture.

Rests on the providence of God.

CHAP. VIII. revelation as distinct from natural religion, either in th orthodox sense or in the sense of Coleridge. He explain revelation as a teaching according to the order of na ture, and yet that order in some way embraces the super natural.

The most eminent writers of the Church of England at the close of the seventeenth century, who were not bishops are Sherlock, John Scott, William Outram, Daniel Whitby, and Joseph Glanvill. William Sherlock was perhaps the most popular theological writer of this era. Besides his great controversy with South, he had a share, as we have seen, in the Roman Catholic controversy, and he had taken both sides as to the oath of allegiance under William. He had defended Stillingfleet against the Nonconformists. He had preached many sermons on public occasions and he had written practical works on death and immortality. Macaulay describes him as a Churchman without any taint of Latitudinarianism, of Puritanism, or of Popery. This means that he did not belong to any of the three parties which constitute the Church of England.

Sherlock.

We have spoken of the chief controversies in which Sherlock was engaged with the exception of the first. This began with his 'Discourse concerning the Knowledge of Jesus Christ.' Sherlock had but little charity either for Roman Catholics or Puritans, and in this sense was far removed from Latitudinarianism. But the theology of this discourse was quite as Latitudinarian as anything to be found in the pages of Tillotson or Fowler. The treatise was directed against the essential part of Puritan theology and anything like a mystical or transcendent view of the union and communion of Christ with believers. It is, in fact, but another form of the question of faith and works. Sherlock speaks of those against whom he writes as quitting Christ's promise and covenant 'to rely and *rowl* upon His person.' He does not deny that we are redeemed by the blood of Christ and saved by His merits, but he says that we have this only by a covenant which has conditions to be performed on our side. The only true knowledge of Christ is love, reverence, and obedience. The union is explained as simply the union of different persons into one society or assembly.

His 'Discourse concerning the Knowledge of Jesus Christ.'

elievers are said to be branches in Christ, but if this were ue in a literal sense, there could be no fruitless branches. Holiness does not proceed from the union, but the measure f holiness constitutes the union. 'We must not,' Sherlock ays, 'dream of fetching life from the person of Christ as ve draw water out of a fountain, but if we would live for ver with Christ we must stedfastly believe and obey His gospel.'*

The controversy was not limited to faith and works. It extended to the whole question of the work of redemption. John Owen had said that 'without Christ it would never have entered into the heart of man to think of God's love and mercy to sinners.' Sherlock answers that this is refuted by the whole experience, both of Jews and Gentiles. Owen said that it was impossible that justice could be averted from transgressors without a propitiation. God is so just that His justice must be satisfied before a pardon can be given. Sherlock calls this a notion of justice perfectly new. All men have reckoned free forgiveness to be entirely compatible with justice. God required a sacrifice, not because without this He could not forgive, but because He chose this method of granting forgiveness. He was full of love to man before the sacrifice was offered. He did not first begin to love after 'His justice had glutted itself with revenge.' The design of Christ's death was to eradicate sin, not to save men notwithstanding their sins. It is unworthy of God to suppose that He required satisfaction. 'The devil,' Sherlock says, 'is very good when he is pleased.' Owen said that God ordained and appointed sin that the punishment of it might manifest divine justice, and the pardon of it divine mercy. Sherlock pitied those who were left 'out of the roll of election, and who have no way to satisfy the divine justice but by their eternal torments.' He upbraided the orthodox with their inconsistency in shaping religion according to their own fancies, with introducing an infinite number of propositions and school terms not to be found in Scripture, and at the same time decrying reason as something profane and carnal. 'God,' he says, 'hath sent His Son into the world to make a plain and easy and perfect

Denies the doctrine of satisfaction to divine justice.

* P. 162.

CHAP. VIII.

revelation of His will, to publish such a religion as may approve itself to our reason and captivate our affections by its natural charms and beauties, and there cannot be a greater injury to the Christian religion than to render it obscure and unintelligible.' * †

John Scott.

John Scott succeeded Sharp as vicar of St. Giles-in-the-Fields. He was not a controversialist, if we except the part imposed on him in the defence of Protestantism under James II. He declined the bishopric of Chester, and seems to have avoided politics as well as theological controversy. He tells us, indeed, in the preface to his great work on the 'Christian Life,' that the troubles of his country had made him sick of this world, and had driven him to give his mind entirely to 'heavenly contemplations.' In one sense, this seems a poor conclusion for a theologian who claimed to be guided by reason. But Wisdom is justified of all her children. Scott despaired of the triumph of righteousness in this world, yet he believed that there was another world where it would triumph.

This question of righteousness was an earnest question with all the theologians of this age. Authority had be-

* P. 137.

† The two chief answers to this 'Discourse' were by Robert Fergusson and Edward Polhill. Fergusson was a Presbyterian, and is well known in history for his natural love of sedition. He called his book 'The Interest of Reason in Religion.' He vindicated Dissenters from the charge of being enemies to reason, and said that Sherlock was thoroughly baptized into the principles of Pelagianism and Socinianism. He defended the imputation of righteousness, claiming the formularies of the Church of England as on his side. Fergusson's treatise is remarkable as an extreme assertion of the principle that revelation is to be found only in the Bible. He shows the necessity of supernatural revelation, and the expediency of its being committed to writing as the only way 'not obnoxious to fallibility.' Edward Polhill was a country gentleman in Sussex. He defended the Puritan doctrine of the imputation of righteousness and the other tenets of decided Calvinism.

In a 'Defence and Continuation' of his 'Discourse,' Sherlock vindicated himself from the charges of Pelagianism and Socinianism. He said that the Church of England, 'the best-constituted Church in the world,' was torn into a thousand factions by new discoveries in theology. He accepted willingly the reproach of his enemies that he really taught that 'Christ is able to save all those who repent and believe and reform their lives, and that He will save none but upon these terms.' The Church of England, he says, teaches that God forgives freely without the thought of 'a legal righteousness of works, and of the imputation of Christ's perfect righteousness and obedience to make us righteous before God' (p. 212). He explains 'works' in Art. XIII. as 'not good works,' and he supposes that there may have been many reasons unknown to us why God sent His Son into the world without having recourse to the theory of satisfying a 'vindictive justice.'

CHAP. VIII.

come identified with superstition, and religious inspiration had degenerated into enthusiasm. These, Scott said,* were the two thieves between which men sought to crucify the Church of England, with its rational religion. The time had come when it was necessary to convince men that religion had an everlasting foundation in immutable and eternal reason. Its essence, Scott said, was not a law imposed by an arbitrary will. Heaven and hell were not merely places of reward or punishment reserved till a future time. They were the necessary fruits of virtue and vice. As men become virtuous they rise to heaven, and as they become vicious, by a fatal tendency, they sink down to hell. 'There is,' he adds, 'as inseparable a connection between grace and glory, vice and hell, as between fire and heat, frost and cold, or any other necessary cause and its effect.'† When this is established, he finds a fixed foundation for proving the truth of Christianity.

On rational religion.

The whole of Scott's treatise is pervaded by a melancholy feeling of the inevitable wretchedness of this present life. Even its pleasures are explained as only cessations of pain. We eat, drink, and sleep, merely to be delivered for a time from the burdens of existence. It is in the future life that we are to reap the fruits of well-doing, and this well-doing consists in the life of reason. God does not ask us to serve Him for His glory, but for our own good. He requires nothing from His creatures, 'for He is enough of stage and theatre to Himself, and hath the same satisfying prospect of His own glory in the midst of all the loud blasphemies of hell, as among the perpetual hallelujahs of heaven.' The good which the righteous shall enjoy, is the free and unfettered exercise of their rational faculties. They shall know God and His works, and they shall live in accordance with everlasting law. Man, at first, was intended for a lower state, where his reason would have been more in harmony than it is now with the earthly or animal nature. But since the fall, life in this world has been a ruin. Christianity regards it as such, and proposes another life, higher than that of the first earthly paradise. 'Now we are no longer to

On the 'Christian Life.'

* 'Christian Life,' dedication to Bishop Compton.

† Preface to 'Christian Life.'

CHAP. VIII.

look upon this world as our native country, but as a foreign land, and so we are to reckon ourselves strangers and pilgrims upon earth, and, accordingly, to use the conveniences of this life as strangers do their inns, not to abide or take up our habitations in them, but only to bait and away.'*

Scott's theology is substantially orthodox. He accepts the doctrine of substitution for sin as it was generally understood in his time. He vindicates the claims of Episcopacy to Divine institution, and he makes the kingdom of Christ, in its proper sense, the visible Church. God has revealed to us what is good in various ways. He has given us natural law. By experience he has confirmed to us that the keeping of this law is good. He has given us 'the great Bible of Nature.'† But He also gives us the gospel. In the gospel we have a clear republication of the laws of nature, with the revelation of a Mediator whose work is to take away sin. Christianity has been successful in the world because it was reasonable.‡ It was established by miracles, which, as interruptions of nature, were proper accompaniments for a new revelation. The being of God, and natural religion, rest on 'a standing miracle,' which is the existence of the world itself.§ Christianity is valued because its sole design is the complete restoration of the whole man to the divine life. Its positive institutions have this end, and when they fail to effect this the observance of them is worthless.

Natural religion, the foundation of revealed.

Dr. Outram on the sacrifice of Christ.

Dr. William Outram's dissertation on the sacrifice of Christ is described by Bishop Burnet as expressing the view of the atonement generally received by the clergy in his time. It was written with reference to the Socinian controversy, and was intended for a refutation of the Socinian doctrine of sacrifice. The first Socinians, indeed, were not agreed in their views of the atonement. But Dr. Outram had specially before him the opinions of Crellius, who said that Christ delivered men from the punishment of sin, but not by bearing the punishment Himself. The atonement was not vicarious. In a preliminary dissertation on the sacrifices of the Jews and Pagans, Dr. Outram finds

* P. 11.
† P. 202.
‡ Sermon on Luke ix. 56.
§ P. 221.

at all sacrifice had respect to God. It was intended to btain His favour. He finds also that the expiatory victims, y their vicarious sufferings, expiated the sins of those for hom they were offered. The question of the origin of crifice was not determined. Dr. Outram felt that nothing ould contribute more to bring out the meaning of Christ's crifice than the determination of the question if sacrifice as instituted by God or devised by man. If the former, may have been absolutely necessary for the removal of uilt, but if the latter, it may have been sanctioned by God erely in condescension to human ideas. The sacrifice of hrist might thus be nothing more than a Jewish mode of xpressing the divine forgiveness of sin. Those who advote the divine origin say that so holy and innocent a man s Abel could never have thought that the slaughter of inocent animals would be acceptable to God. They added lso the words of the Epistle to the Hebrews, that Abel's crifice was offered by faith, and that 'faith' can only ean obedience to a divine command. Those who take the ther side say that on this principle Cain also must have ad faith, for he obeyed the command. But if the idea rose spontaneously in the mind of so wicked a man as ain, much more might it have arisen in the mind of ighteous Abel. Chrysostom, Irenæus, Justin Martyr, and ther Fathers are quoted for the view that sacrifices were ot of divine origin, but were instituted by God among the ews because that people had become accustomed in Egypt o that mode of worship. But all sacrifice was intended to btain the divine favour, and among the Jews the piacular acrifices, which were specially typical of Christ, were said o bear the sins of those for whom they were offered. 'It s the blood that maketh atonement for the soul.'

Christ's work has respect to God. He is 'an advocate with the Father.' He makes intercession for us in the presence of God. It is not enough that Christ be propitious. God also must be propitious. Christ was the propitiation. He presented Himself to God as an expiatory victim slain for our sins. He suffered in our stead. On this subject Dr. Outram uses the strongest language that can be used. He takes literally all the Hebrew expressions of the New

Christ an expiatory victim.

CHAP. VIII.

Testament writers while he is refuting the Socinians. But he was not willing to abide by all the consequences which followed from taking these expressions literally. He denied that Christ made satisfaction to God with His life or blood. This was done only by His sufferings and His obedience. God appointed that Christ should suffer and He was satisfied with the obedience of His Son. The victims under the Jewish law suffered the same kind of punishment that was due to the transgressor. But this cannot, Dr. Outram says, be 'truly and properly affirmed concerning Jesus Christ. He did not endure those eternal punishments and that despair of salvation from which we are delivered.' His sufferings were not in reality a literal price. They only 'obtained the pardon of our sins on condition of our being disposed to yield obedience to God.' The punishment inflicted on a transgressor, when equal to the guilt, is the penalty, and frees from any further liability. But in a vicarious punishment this is only effected through the favour of him who has the right to punish. The death of Christ avails only because of the will of God, and it avails only for them that have faith and piety. These explanations of the sacrifice of Christ, which are simply those of the Arminian theology, have, in the judgment of many persons, placed Dr. Outram on the side of those whom he promised to refute.

Dr. Whitby.

Daniel Whitby's public life begins under the patronage of Seth Ward, the High Church Bishop of Salisbury, and it ends, for he lived to the great age of eighty-eight, in entire agreement with Benjamin Hoadly, the heretical Bishop of Bangor and Winchester. Whitby's ingenuous and earnest mind had liberal tendencies from his youth, and during all the days of his long life he continued to learn. His first writings were on the Roman Catholic controversy, and the question of conformity, the great subjects of that day. His last works are chiefly on the Trinity. These we shall meet again. His great work on the 'Five Points' we pass by, as representing simply the theology of Arminius. For our present object we have a treatise on the evidences of Christianity, another on original sin, and a volume of rational sermons.

CHAP. VIII.

On the evidences of Christianity.

The treatise on the evidences is one of Whitby's earliest works. It was published in 1671,* and like other works of the same kind, it is full of lamentations over the prevalence of atheism and unbelief. The atheism, however, does not appear to have been more than a misapprehension of the doctrine of Hobbes; and the unbelief was chiefly the profligacy that prevailed in the reign of Charles. Authors who openly denied the existence of the Deity, or the truth of the Christian revelation, had not yet appeared, and if they had, it is doubtful if they would have been convinced by the books that were then written on the evidences. Whitby proves, first, that there must be a Providence. His proof is, that if there are evil spirits, there must be a good Spirit to control them; and that there are evil spirits is evident from the testimony of heathen oracles, from persons being possessed by demons, and from the devil being worshipped in so many countries of the world. To this is added the fact of miracles wrought in demonstration of religion, whether that of Jew, Turk, or Pagan; and the fact of visible declarations of divine wrath—prodigies, dreams, apparitions, or prophecies. To these all history bears testimony. Then we have miraculous answers to prayer. Theodosius was able to vanquish Eugenius and Maximus by praying to God. Antoninus, by prayer, brought down rain and thunder on his enemies. We have also evidence of the existence of Providence from ghosts or spirits that come to instruct us or to frighten us; from miracles wrought by such heretics as Gnostics, Carpocratians, or Saturnalians; from Finland witches, Chaldæan magi, and Egyptian sorcerers. All these, if for good, are proofs of the existence of Deity; if not for good, they show that Satan is busy opposing some truth or religion which God is establishing.

Christian miracles and other miracles.

It is not meant that God permits miracles to be wrought indifferently for any religion, but evil spirits work miracles for false religions, and God works miracles for the true. The evidence to us which is the true is found in the higher character of the miracles wrought. They are more

* The title is 'ΛΟΓΟΣ ΤΗΣ ΠΙΣΤΕΩΣ, or an Endeavour to Evince the Certainty of Christian Faith in General, and of the Resurrection of Christ in Particular.' In 1691, Whitby published another work on the evidences, the arguments of which were in substance the same as in the first.

CHAP. VIII.

convincing, more numerous, and more unquestionably true miracles, than those wrought for other religions. To this we have to add the fulfilment of prophecies, and the superior excellence of the Christian religion. It is such as becomes the wisdom, purity, and goodness of God. That unquestionable miracles had been wrought in the first ages of Christianity is proved by many testimonies. The Apostles appealed to well-known miracles. They asked their converts if they had not the gifts of the Holy Ghost. The power of miracles was in the believers by the imposition of the Apostles' hands, and they must have known that they possessed this power. They could not be deceived when they delivered up to Satan some false Christians, healed the sick by prayer and unction, or spoke languages which they had never learned. They could cast out the devil, who is a spirit; and a spirit, being invisible, could only be cast out by an invisible power. Christ and His apostles would have refused the assistance of evil angels, and it is impossible that good angels could have helped them to deceive the world. Christ had no temptation to deceive. He lived no indulgent life, nor sought to gain anything by His religion being believed. Whitby's reverence for antiquity did not allow him to suppose that miracles ceased with the Apostles. For centuries, he says, the Christians appealed 'to the gifts and powerful operations of the Holy Ghost they daily exercised.'* The genuineness of the books of the New Testament is proved from the existence, in the early ages, of autograph copies which were well known to be genuine, and which could not be corrupted, because there were copies in different churches. Whitby adds that, between the texts quoted by the Fathers and the same texts as they are now read, there is no variation of importance.

The miracles of the early Church.

Hitherto the ground has been only prepared for the main argument, which is, that the Christian faith is proved from the gifts and operations of the Holy Ghost, that is, the gifts of prophecy and of tongues. That the first Christians had these gifts is shown from the Acts of the Apostles, and the testimonies of the Fathers. Irenæus, Justin Martyr, and Eusebius, speak distinctly of visions, predictions, and reve-

* P. 102.

ions of things secret, being common in their day, and cessary for the Christian Church.* This was agreeable to e promise made by Christ, that the Spirit would lead them to all truth, and show them things to come. They could so work miracles. Irenæus says that they could still cure e lame or the paralytic with a touch. Arnobius and rigen challenge the Pagans to do miracles equal to these, ding that even the simplest and most rustic Christians could st out devils either from beasts or men.† Other evidences the truth of Christianity are drawn from comets, earth-akes, and miracles wrought at the graves of holy Chris-ns.

On original sin.

The object of the treatise on original sin is to deny the iputation of Adam's sin to the human race. Whitby sup-ses that Adam was created with a body liable to death, t, if he had not sinned, that body would not have died. emporal death was properly the punishment of Adam's ansgression. And this temporal death, in virtue of Adam's n, passed upon all men. Without redemption, the pos-rity of Adam would have suffered eternal death, that is, ere would have been no resurrection from the dead. The w had been broken, the devil had obtained power to inflict eath on mankind, but Christ bound him who had the power death, and took away the sting which it had from the law. y Adam's transgression we also came under sin in the nse of being liable to the assaults of irregular affections id passions, so that it was almost impossible for us to live ithout sin. This is the meaning of St. Paul's earnest long-g to be delivered from the bondage of corruption. He aited for 'the redemption of the body.' Whitby quotes om many Fathers to show that this was the common view f sin and redemption in the primitive Church. Ignatius ys, Christ died 'that mortality might be expiated.' Irenæus nd Justin Martyr say that Christ was crucified because man-ind were fallen 'by death,' and almost all the Fathers teach hat Christ went to Hades to deliver the souls that were in rison, or, as Hilary expresses it, 'to deliver those whom eath detained in the lower parts of the earth.'

The objection concerning the justice of God which Whitby

* P. 134. † P. 173.

CHAP. VIII.

God's justice defended.

wishes to obviate, is evidently the same on his theory as the hypothesis which he refutes. The innocent are st treated as guilty. The consequences of Adam's sin are visit on his posterity. There may still be a question of t nature and extent of these consequences, but the princip so far, has been admitted. Whitby's defence is that no are punished everlastingly for the mere sin of Adam, and have deprived the race of existence because of the first tran gression was no injustice, as God was under no obligation continue their existence.

Whitby's explanation of this mysterious question may n be the true one. We do not for a moment suppose that it i Yet it is an effort to give an answer agreeable to reason. is an effort to vindicate eternal justice. The doctrine of in putation, which he opposes, implies a direct act of the Deit in visiting original sin upon the descendants of Adam. H own theory is supposed to escape this by making the suffe ing of Adam's posterity a natural result of Adam's si Children suffer for the sins of their parents, and this being t ordinary course of Providence, it is concluded that it mu be just. The innocent are involved with the guilty, ar lose what otherwise they would have had. But as God owe them nothing, the objection of injustice is supposed to l removed. One of the illustrations which Whitby uses i that of the leprosy clinging to the posterity of Joab an Gehazi. Their posterity suffered, but 'by the very princi ples of nature,' and so injustice is not to be charged on Goc The whole argument supposes an order or necessity i nature, not only distinct from God, but independent of Hin an order for which He is not responsible. It makes a con venient temporary distinction between the works of God an the works of nature.

Original sin and infant baptism.

On the supposition that what nature does is not done b God, Whitby refutes the popular doctrine of the imputation of Adam's sin, but he admits the pollution and corruption of humanity as the natural result of that sin. Adam's posterity are not charged with his sin, but in consequence of it they suffer as sinners. The practice of infant baptism was supposed to be an acknowledgment of original sin, but Whitby answers that Christ, who had no sin, was baptized. He quotes

ny Fathers who denied original sin, and yet advocated ptizing infants. Clemens Alexandrinus says that David, ough born in sin, that is, descended from a sinful mother, ve, yet was not a sinner. Cyril of Jerusalem says that we are not sinners by birth,' but, 'coming into the world free om evil, we sin by the choice of our mind.' Arnobius says pressly that 'all who are born undergo the same sentence ith Adam, but are not guilty of Adam's sin.' Chrysostom ys that by Adam we became mortal, yet it would be 'a smal consequence' if, for his disobedience, 'another should judged criminal.' Theodoret says that we are not sinners nature, but only as 'we give way to the violence of our assions.' And Rufinus is very plain. He says, 'They rave ho condemn all the world as guilty of iniquity and wicked-ess only on account of one man Adam, for they who say ese things either pronounce God unjust, or at least esteem e devil to be more powerful than God, in that the devil as able to make that nature become evil which God created ood, through the transgression of Adam and Eve, if thereby ll men become guilty of sin.' Besides many quotations om the Fathers, Whitby quotes the testimonies of such arned writers as Petavius, Whitaker, Peter du Moulin, nd Sirmond, who unanimously declare that before Augus-ne the Fathers denied original sin, and that Augustine imself was a Pelagian before his controversy with the elagians. To these are added the testimonies of Jews nd Pagans, Solomon and Plato, Aristotle and Simplicius, icero and Antoninus, with many others, whose principles of ature and reason would be overthrown if it were true that dam's sin is imputed to his posterity.

Whitby's sermon on reason.

Whitby's sermons are more satisfactory than either of the ther two volumes.* But we are not to forget that half a entury had elapsed between the publication of the treatise on the evidences and that of the sermons. That half cen-ury was an era of rapid change, in which the old theology ad given place to the new. In these sermons, Whitby speaks with great decision, great clearness, and with argu-ments that cannot be overthrown. He stands everywhere by Chillingworth and reason. The Church of England is to

* 'Sermons on Several Occasions,' 1720.

CHAP. VIII.

him the incarnation of the spirit of rational religion. He repeats the often repeated simile of its being crucified between two thieves. The malefactors, however, are not the Papist and the Puritan, but the 'Profest Roman Catholic and the Protestant Papist; the first condemning it as heretical and schismatical for departing from the Church of Rome, the second, if he will be consistent with his principles, laying us under the necessity of returning to it.'* The first sermon is called 'Reason our Guide in Religion.' The text is, 'And why even of yourselves judge ye not what is right?' It is an old question, Whitby says, and yet a very senseless question,—who shall be judge? In all cases in which men are concerned to pass any judgment, they can only do it by the faculty of reason. Jesus, in the text, ratifies the lessons of experience, that we have sufficient means of judging between right and wrong, just and unjust. It is not to be supposed that our assent would be required to any article of faith till we had a sufficient assurance that it was revealed by God, and the assurance can only come through reason. We must be satisfied that Scripture is God's word, and that the Scripture really says what we understand it to say. 'In this,' Whitby argues, 'all men seem agreed, seeing all commentators on the Holy Scriptures, ancient or modern, Protestant or Papist, endeavour to confute that sense of Scripture they reject from the supposed absurdities which follow from it, that is from reason, and to confirm that sense of Scripture they embrace by those reasons they allege for the truth of it. And so both of them do consent in this, that reason is to be judge of the true sense of Scripture.'† 'The certainty of our whole faith,' he adds, 'depends upon the certainty of that reason we have to believe it true, and so must stand or fall with it. If we reject the use of reason here, we level the best religion in the world with the wildest and most absurd enthusiasm.' From this conclusion are drawn some inferences, and especially this, 'that no man can believe what he doth not, or cannot, understand, for then he must believe he knows not what, and so must do it without all ground or reason.' All articles of faith must be within the comprehension of reason. An

All parties assume the supremacy of reason.

* Ded. p. xxii.

† P. 6.

xplanation, however, is added, that there are mysteries in eligion as well as in nature. We cannot understand in every case the mode of being, but every doctrine revealed to us is comprehensible so far as it is revealed. To say that it s incomprehensible, is to say that it is not revealed.

God knowable if revealed.

The second sermon is on 'Understanding the Attributes of God.' This is an application of the principles of reason to the doctrine of Deity. If God is revealed, we must know Him. If we do not know Him, He is not revealed. This, however, does not mean that our finite minds can comprehend the Infinite. It only means that our knowledge of God, so far as it goes, is real knowledge. He is good, just, and true, in the sense that men understand goodness, justice, and truth. It might be possible to convict Whitby of here aying down two positions not logically reconcilable. His previous argument supposes every article of faith to be so far comprehensible that the comprehensibility entered into the evidence of its truth. He now recommends 'the old rule in revelations of this nature, that we ought not to inquire how that can be which God hath assured us that it is.'* This seems to imply an assurance from external evidence sufficient to authorize belief, whatever might be the contents of the revelation. The two positions might probably be reconciled by supposing Whitby's meaning to be that things revealed are so far rational as to commend themselves to reason; yet, being convinced that God has spoken, it need not interfere with faith that things naturally beyond our faculties are beyond them still.

The Scriptures the only rule of faith.

The title of the third sermon is 'The Holy Scripture our Rule of Faith.' The Apostles used great plainness of speech. They did not, like Moses, put a veil before their faces. They did not speak in parables, or by types and shadows. If they spoke plainly things that were not necessary, much more may we expect that in things necessary they spoke with equal plainness, and that their writings would not be less clear than their sermons. At the Reformation all Protestant Churches took their stand by the Scriptures as the only rule of faith. The Church of England, Whitby says, was emphatic on this point beyond all other Churches. Art. VI.

* P. 22.

CHAP. VIII.

says, 'Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation. Bishops and priests are asked in the Ordination Service i. 'they are persuaded that the Holy Scriptures contain sufficiently all doctrine required of necessity for eternal salvation.' The Homilies say 'that whatever is required to the salvation of men is fully contained in the Scriptures of God.' This, Whitby adds, is the constant doctrine of the Church of England, and therefore 'they who do require us to pray for the dead, or to offer up to God the sacrament, as being the tradition of the Church, or tell us that the best and safest way for the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures is to repair to the primitive Fathers or the decrees of General Councils, are not the genuine members of the Church of England, nor do they act agreeably to their subscriptions or to the profession made by them at their ordination.'* It is not said that all things in the Scriptures are clear, but only all things necessary to be believed and done. The very expression 'clear' means that they are clear to reason; so that the use of reason is implied in the appeal to Scripture. If we go to Fathers, Councils, or Church traditions for the meaning of Scripture, this implies that the Scriptures are not clear in things necessary. It is 'to cast a vile imputation upon that Spirit of wisdom by which the Scriptures were indited.'† It is to suppose that the Author of the Scriptures has 'acted as no wise lawgiver ever did, or thought fit to do; for do any of them make laws in matters necessary to be observed by their subjects so obscurely as that they cannot be obeyed till they are interpreted to them by the judges, or cleared by some other means?'‡ Whitby doubts if by tradition we have the proper meaning of even one text of Scripture, while, he says, it is certain that the Fathers have perverted many texts, and their false interpretations have passed current for centuries.

Christians to prove all things.

The fourth sermon is on 'The Right of Christians to examine the Truth of all Things that are proposed to them as Articles of Faith.' It is an apostolic law, binding equally on clergy and laity, that they are 'to try all things, and hold fast that which is good.' Laymen are to beware of false prophets, which they can only do by trying the doc-

* P. 48. † P. 57. ‡ P. 61.

ines of those who profess to be their teachers. 'Such CHAP. VIII.
earers,' St. Basil says, 'as are instructed in the Scriptures
ight to try the things spoken by their teachers, and receive
ose things which are consonant to the Scriptures, and
ject those which are alien from them, because St. Paul
th said, Try all things, and hold fast that which is
od.' * Clemens of Alexandria, Origen, and Cyril are
oted as exhorting all hearers to examine the doctrines
ught them, as money-changers test money, that they may
eceive the good and reject the bad. Without this examina-
ion, Whitby says, Christians can have no faith, for 'faith
s an act of reason' seated in 'the understanding faculty.'
He argues that if faith be an act of reason, it is impossible
at any person should have faith without a reason of that
aith. In the other sermons we have similar principles.
Sincerity in inquiring, even if a man misses the truth, is
naintained to be sufficient to procure the favour of God.†
n the last day the question will not be concerning what
man has believed, but what he has done. If we have
ur fruit unto holiness, the end shall be everlasting life.
Faith is no further necessary to salvation than it is neces-
ary to this end, that we may lead a virtuous life.' ‡ Jesus
aid, 'Ye are my friends if ye do whatsoever I command
ou.' Heresy is a work of the flesh, and therefore no good
an, whatever be his errors, can be a heretic. The arti-
les of faith must be very few, for, according to St. Jude,
hey were all delivered in his time. This must free us from
ny obligation to believe the decrees of Councils or any later
additions to the faith once delivered to the saints. The first
ormal Creed is that which is called the Apostles'. Whatever
s not contained in it need not be regarded as a doctrine of
he primitive Church. We cannot suppose that its authors
would have omitted any fundamental doctrine or anything
necessary to be believed for eternal salvation. The Churches
of later ages could not make 'the narrow way to life more
narrow than our Saviour and His Apostles made it.' § To
the plea that the later Creeds were explanations of the
earlier, Whitby answers, 'To say that the Creed which
passeth under the name of Athanasius is an explanation of

Later creeds more obscure than the Apostles' Creed.

* P. 93. † P. 117. ‡ P. 152. § P. 175.

CHAP. VIII.

the sense of the Apostles' Creed is, in effect, to affirm that Creed which is intricate, and not intelligible by the wises of men, is an explanation of a Creed plain and easy to b understood.'* It is denied in one sermon that any externa government is essential to Christianity, or that a Churc cannot exist without a succession of bishops.† In anothe sermon it is shown that if simony, as both the Eastern an Western Churches maintain, is sufficient to interrupt th episcopal succession, no such succession has existed in th Church without frequent interruptions.

Joseph Glanvill.

The memory of Joseph Glanvill‡ would have perished lon since but for his famous treatise on 'Witches and Appari tions.' The 'Demon of Tedworth' and the 'Witch of Shep ton Mallet' now preserve his fame, as once they helped hi to prove the existence of God, of angels and spirits, or a least of devils. The most rational theologians seem, in Glan vill's time, to have been the most zealous believers in appa ritions, and in the power of old women to work wonders. Bishop Fowler, Bishop Rust, Henry More, and Hezekia Burton were all associated with Glanvill as zealous student of the science of witchcraft. It was founded, they said, o testimony, even the sure testimony of sense. They foun the phenomena to establish and corroborate their specula tions concerning the nature of immaterial beings. Joseph Glanvill, however, is not to be estimated merely by his book on witches. He was an earnest student of physical science, one of the first and most zealous members of the

His scepti-cism.

Royal Society, and a strenuous advocate of scepticism in the sense of subjecting everything to free investigation. This is indicated by the very titles of some of his works, as 'Scepsis Scientifica,' and the 'Vanity of Dogmatizing.' Nor did he wish to confine inquiry merely to matters of science and philosophy. He vindicated the freest use of reason in all that concerned religion, making religion to consist mainly in duty. He found it all in the Ten Commandments, and the Ten Commandments he found to have their foundation in reason. Some other things concerning the worship of God were in the Apostles' Creed, and the two Sacraments were to be

* P. 178.
† P. 292.
‡ Glanvill was Rector of Bath and Chaplain to Charles II.

bserved as the only positive rites of Christianity. He would ot, he said, 'undertake for all the opinions some men are leased to call orthodox.'* Reason he pronounced to be the vord of God, and faith in it, faith in God's veracity. Religion being simply duty, was no difficult thing to understand. The Church of England has creeds and articles of faith, but hese, Glanvill says, are merely articles of communion or ellowship, not 'doctrines absolutely necessary to salvation.'† On many other questions Glanvill was entirely at one with he Cambridge divines. His opposition to the authority of Aristotle, and, indeed, to all authority, either in science or eligion, except that of evidence, made him many adversaries. By some of the clergy he was charged with being an atheist; a curious charge, certainly, against the author of 'Saducismus Triumphatus,' who regarded all as atheists that did not believe in witches.

The only work of Glanvill's which requires special notice is 'Lux Orientalis,' a treatise on the pre-existence of souls. As this doctrine had ceased to be generally believed by the Christian world, the author dwells, in the preface, on the freedom which the Church of England allows in all matters of mere speculation. On a few questions, he says, a general consent is required, for the sake of 'peace and order,' but the Church does not impose difficult and disputable matters under the notion of confessions of faith and fundamentals of religion. No church has ever determined against the pre-existence of souls. It had been revived in England by Henry More, and the author of a 'Treatise on Origen.'‡ Glanvill advocates it, among other reasons, that he may clear the Divine Being from any imputation of injustice to man. This, he thought, was not done by the popular doctrine of our inheriting Adam's sin; but if we existed before, and if our existence here be a punishment for our sins in a previous state of being, the justice of God is vindicated for our present suffering.

On the pre-existence of souls.

There were two theories concerning the soul which divided both the Fathers and the Schoolmen. The first sup-

* 'Philosophia Pia, or a Discourse of the Experimental Philosophy,' p. 160.

† *Ib.* p. 159.

‡ This treatise is reprinted in the Phœnix, 1707.

CHAP. VIII.

posed that God created souls daily as they are required fo generated bodies. But this theory was liable to man objections, and not the least of these was that it suppose the Divine Being to create pure and innocent souls to b united to feeble, if not sinful bodies. It had been refute by Origen, who showed that it made God accessory to viola tions of the seventh commandment, in providing souls fo all bodies that were generated. Glanvill also brings argu ments against it, drawn from such phenomena as the monste born at Emmaus, mentioned by Sennertus, with two heart and two heads. Could it be supposed, he asks, that Goc created two souls for this monstrous body? Yet 'the diver sity of its appetites, perceptions, and affections, testified i had two souls within that bi-partite habitation.' The othe theory is that of traduction or propagation of souls. Thi embraced two parties, those who say that the soul is matter and those who made the soul spirit. The first was repre sented in modern times by Hobbes, who derived all percep tions from external sense. Glanvill refutes Hobbes, by show ing that we have logical, moral, and metaphysical ideas fron within, independent of sense. The second party suppose that, by the Divine benediction on the primitive parents, th souls were endowed with a capacity of propagation corre sponding to that of bodies. But either, Glanvill says, the sou is produced from nothing, or from something pre-existent. If from nothing, it is an absolute creation, impossible for a creature, and therefore open to all the objections against the theory of immediate or daily creation. If from something pre-existent, it must be from the souls of the parents, but this is against the nature of an immaterial body, which is indiscerptible. The justice of God, according to Glanvill, cannot consist either with the theory of immediate creation or with that of seminal propagation. There remains, then, only the hypothesis of pre-existence. Scripture is silent on the subject, but, as the case stands, this silence is regarded as an argument for pre-existence. It might be objected that, as Adam was created innocent, there could be no reason for supposing that his soul had existed before. To this Glanvill answers, that the supposition in Adam's particular case is not necessary. It may have been that some spirits

The theories of creation and propagation of souls refuted.

ll with the angels, and the creation of Adam with a pure oul and a perfect body, may have been a merciful provision f the Creator. By means of Adam, bodies were provided uitable for the spirits who had rendered themselves inca- able of existing in more refined bodies. Or supposing Adam to have been one of these fallen spirits, it is quite in ccordance with the wisdom and goodness of God to have egun in him the restoration of the race.

The silence of Scripture had been the main argument gainst the pre-existence of souls. Glanvill answers, that Scripture is equally silent concerning immediate creation, or eminal propagation. He then uses this very silence to sup- ort his own hypothesis. It was, he says, the common loctrine of the Jews in the time of Christ. Rabbi Ben Israel s quoted, bearing testimony to this, and the author of the Book of Wisdom,' probably Philo, says 'I was a witty child, and had a good spirit, wherefore the rather being good, I came unto a body undefiled.' The same meaning is found in the answer which Jesus made to His disciples concerning the man that was born blind. The question was 'senseless and impertinent but on the supposition that the blind man's soul existed before he was born.' The same doctrine was implied in the answer to the question 'Whom do men say that I am?' Some said John the Baptist, some Elias, and others Jeremias, or one of the old prophets. If the popular belief was a wrong one, Jesus had opportunities of correcting it, but He was silent. Origen, and some of 'the ancients, affirm that pre-existence was a cabbala which was handed down from the Apostolic ages to their times.' It was lost in the middle ages, when Aristotle's authority prevailed, and Plato was almost forgotten. Glanvill adds arguments from Job and Jeremiah. The sons of God, or the spirits of men, shouted for joy at the creation, and God said to Jeremiah, 'Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee, and before thou camest out of the womb I gave thee wisdom.' Jesus also speaks of the glory which He had with His Father before the world was, which is understood to mean the pre-existence of His humanity.

Pre-existence of souls proved from Scripture.

When Lord Bacon advocated the method of induction from observation and experience in the study of the natural world,

CHAP. VIII.

Lord Bacon and induction.

he was careful to say that his method was not applicable in religion. Articles of faith were to be sought in revelation, and not in the study of nature. This distinction in the abstract is generally received, but practically it disappears. All science has a direct influence on theology. The heavens, Bacon said, declare God's glory, but the Scriptures reveal His will. Bacon's disciples, however, soon learned to read the will of God in the works of nature.

The Royal Society.

The Royal Society, which was established by Charles II., began at Oxford. Its first members met at Dr. Wilkins' lodgings in Wadham College. It was patronized by liberal churchmen, and opposed by the old theologians, who had a true instinct that theology and natural science could not be separated as Lord Bacon had wished to separate them. The Society had also among its most earnest members many High Churchmen, who, in the simplicity of their hearts, believed that natural knowledge was independent of religion.

Its history by Bishop Sprat.

The first historian of the Society was Thomas Sprat, afterwards Bishop of Rochester. Sprat was a bishop at the advent of William of Orange. He has been omitted in his proper place that we might speak of him only in connection with the Royal Society. In the dedication of his work to the King, he remarks that the gods whom the pagans 'worshipped with temples and altars were those who instructed the world to plow, to sow, to plant, to spin, to build houses, and to found new countries.' He adds that the true God also has not 'omitted to show the value of vulgar arts.' In all the history of the first monarchs of the world, from Adam to Noah, there is no mention of their wars or their victories. We only read that they 'taught their posterity to keep sheep, to till the ground, to plant vineyards, to dwell in tents, to build cities, to play on the harp and organ, and to work in brass and iron.' The dedication is followed by Cowley's well-known poem 'To the Royal Society,' in which 'Philosophy' is described as the heir of all human knowledge,

> 'Unforfeited by man's rebellious sin;'

while Bacon is said to have chased away—

> 'Authority, which did a body boast,
> Though 'twas but air condensed, and stalked about,
> Like some old giant's more gigantic ghost.'

CHAP. VIII.

Christianity and philosophy.

The early Christians, according to Bishop Sprat, learned ıilosophy that they might refute the pagans. But after ınquishing the heathen philosophers by weapons of philo- ›phy, instead of laying these weapons aside, they 'unfor- ınately fell to manage them one against another.' The ·sult was that the religion of Jesus Christ, 'which con- sted in the plain and direct rules of good life and charity, ıd the belief in a redemption by our Saviour, was miserably ivided into a thousand intricate questions, which neither lvance true piety nor good manners.'* From these dis- ıtings arose many heresies, which the Church, by argu- ıent, and where that failed by the help of the civil magis- ate, succeeded in extirpating. All learning after this, till ıe Reformation, was confined to the Church, and consisted ıainly in matters that concerned religion and worship. he schoolmen reasoned from general definitions without ·gard to the facts of nature. They are welcome, Bishop prat says, to their own domain. They may still preside in ıe schools over controversies in theology. But the realm of ature must be explored. After warding off the scholastic ıeologians from the territory of nature, the Bishop intimates ıat religion also would be better without them. It does ɔt require their help; while the time and talent wasted in isputes about religion might be profitably used in the study f nature.

Supposed danger to religion from natural studies.

The Bishop, however, is cautious, perhaps undecided, it ıay be contradictory, when he speaks of the gains of religion ·om the study of natural science. He proves that experi- ıents are not dangerous to Christianity, and to go thus far eemed to be going a long way. The position is guarded ›y a distinct profession of faith in Christianity; and the lternative is chosen, that if the results of natural studies vere to deprive men of the hopes of a future life, they were o be abandoned. Prudence and policy, it is said, as well as levotion, would forbid an enterprise so full of hazard and nischief. This would be to destroy the most prevailing argu- nent for virtue, and to bring on men the punishment which he ancients fabled of those who contended with the gods, to ›e immediately changed into beasts. The Royal Society had

* P. 12.

CHAP. VIII.

expressly declared that 'things spiritual' were beyond their province. It was objected that the question was not a present one. The results of these studies would affect Christianity in the future. It is this supposition which Bishop Sprat answers. He relegates the special teaching of Christianity to the authority of revelation. That which it has in common with natural religion he shows to be confirmed rather than weakened by natural science. The student of science is, indeed, employed about visible things, but that very study leads him to the verge of the invisible. 'In every work of nature that he handles, he knows that there is not only a gross substance, which presents itself to all men's eyes, but an infinite subtilty of parts which come not unto the sharpest sense. So that what the Scripture relates of the purity of God, of the spirituality of His nature, and that of angels and the souls of men, cannot seem incredible to him, when he perceives the numberless particles that move in every man's blood, and the prodigious streams that continually flow unseen from every body. Having found that his own senses have been so far assisted by the instruments of art, he may sooner admit that his mind ought to be raised higher by a heavenly light in those things wherein his senses do fall short. If, as the Apostle says, the invisible things of God are manifested by the visible, then how much stronger arguments has he for his belief in the eternal power and Godhead from the vast number of creatures that are invisible to others, but are exposed to his view by the help of his experiments.'*

Christianity established by the inductive method.

The main doctrine of Christianity is the revelation of salvation by Jesus Christ. This, according to Bishop Sprat, has been proved by the natural philosopher's method of experience. The argument is that Christ demonstrated His divine authority by miracles. These miracles were undeniable signs of almighty power, 'divine experiments of His Godhead.' What, it is asked, can an impartial inquirer into nature wish more than a testimony from heaven? Christ's miracles were 'philosophical works performed by an almighty hand.' The fact that they were not seen by the experimental philosophers who were to believe them is not a part

* P. 349.

Bishop's argument. The authority of the Revealer thus supposed to be established by experience, it is ..d that whatever is revealed must be received, however y transcend reason. In that part of Christianity which ..in, there is no need of philosophy, and that which is ..natural is beyond philosophy's reach. Religion and philosophy must agree to a divorce for their mutual peace and well-being. The opponents of the Royal Society expressed fears that researches into nature would destroy the belief in supernatural works and explain unusual phenomena by natural causes. Bishop Sprat answers that this would be a desirable issue. We ought, he says, to be on our guard against regarding prodigies in nature as immediate signs from heaven. We should rather learn to see God's miraculous providence in the ordinary course of nature. Christianity, having been once established by miracles, does not, it is argued, require a continuance of signs and wonders; and by taking care that no false miracles are believed, we help to confirm those that are true.

Bishop Sprat shows that not only is experimental philosophy not dangerous to Christianity, but that the objects of the Royal Society are in special harmony with the spirit of the Church of England. That Church stands solely by the word of God. It avoids the extremes of 'implicit faith and enthusiasm.' It stands apart from the Church of Rome, but not on the principles of the 'Separatists;' and it opposes the 'Separatists,' but not on the principles of the Church of Rome. It rests on 'the rights of the civil power, the imitation of the first uncorrupt Churches, and the Scripture expounded by reason.' We cannot, then, the Bishop adds, 'make war against reason without undermining our own strength, seeing it is the constant weapon we ought to employ.'* The parallel is continued between the Church of England and the Royal Society, showing that the Church must be safe in a 'rational age,' amid the improvements of knowledge and the subversion of old opinions about nature. The Church of England and the Royal Society lay equal claim to Reformation. The one has done

The Church of England the patron of science.

* P. 362.

CHAP. VIII.

in religion what the other intends to do in philosopl They both pass by 'corrupt copies,' and turn for instructi to 'perfect originals;' the 'one to Scripture, the other the volume of creation.' They are both unjustly accused their enemies of the same crimes, forsaking the ancie traditions and venturing on novelties. They both suppo that their ancestors might err. They both follow the gre apostle's precept, of trying all things. 'It cannot therefo be suspected that the Church of England, which arose the same method, though in different works, that heroical passed through the same difficulties, that relies on the sar sovereign's authority, should look with jealous eyes this attempt, which makes no change in the principles men's consciences, but chiefly aims at the increase of i ventions about the works of their hands.'* The Church

Represents the commercial and enterprising genius of the nation.

England 'would not be fit for the present genius of th nation' if it were an enemy 'to commerce, intelligenc discovery, navigation, or any sort of mechanics.' The see of the Royal Society were sown in 'King Edward VI.'s ar Queen Elizabeth's reign.' Liberty of judging, searchin and reasoning, began with the Reformation. 'The Chur of England, therefore, may be justly styled the mother this sort of knowledge, and so the care of its nourishme and prosperity peculiarly lies upon it.'† The other R formed Churches have been unable to do much for scienc because they wanted the encouragement of the civil magi trate. The Church of Rome has been moved from its o position. It no longer condemns those who believe in th Antipodes, and it permits the Jesuits to make observatio on nature. All these things, Bishop Sprat says, are i favour of reason, on which the Church of England rest against implicit faith and enthusiasm. 'It is now,' he add 'impossible to spread the same clouds over the world agai The universal disposition of this age is bent upon a ration religion. And therefore I renew my affectionate request, tha the Church of England would prepare to have the chie share in its first adventure; that it would persist, as it ha begun, to encourage experiments, which will be to ou

* P. 371. † P. 372.

hurch as the British oak is to our empire, an ornament id defence to the soil where it is planted.' *†

The Hon. Robert Boyle.

The spirit in which religious men supported the Royal ociety we may learn further from the theological writings f one of its most eminent members, the Hon. Robert Boyle. he theology of an ingenuous layman is generally the best ndex to the religious spirit of an age. Both the interests nd the education of the clergy dispose them to isolate re-igion from nature and human life. A layman is not neces-arily under the same restraints, and is less likely to be nfluenced by mere authority. Robert Boyle's love of natural tudies was great, but he made no abrupt separation between he study of nature and the study of God. To vindicate he study of nature, and to determine its relations to religion, s the object of several of his tracts, as 'The Excellency of heology Compared with Natural Philosophy,' 'The Chris-ian Virtuoso,' and 'The Discourse of Things above Reason.'

His 'Excellency of Theology.'

In the first of these, the study of theology is said to be xcellent because of its object. The study of nature only derives its dignity from its connection with that invisible power which pervades nature.' Theology, on the other hand, oes at once to the contemplation of God and the invisible. Boyle says that many persons have put themselves under he power of demons that they might be instructed in the nseen mysteries. They have been successful, but their example is not to be followed. In the natural world we can earn much of God, but revelation is to the natural reason what a telescope is to the naked eye. This illustration, introduced in the very beginning of the book, seems as if Boyle meant the comparison to be between natural theology nd revelation. We conclude from it, that by 'theology,' n the title, he means revelation, and by 'natural philo-

* P. 374.

† The origin of Sprat's 'History of the Royal Society' is ascribed by Birch in his 'Life of Boyle' to the opposition of the 'admirers of the old philosophy, who affected to represent the views of many of its members to be the destruction not only of true learning but of religion itself.' The most active of these was Henry Stubbe, with whom Joseph Glanvill had many controversies. It was also opposed by South in an oration before the University of Oxford, and by old scholastic divines like Gunning, Bishop of Ely, and Barlow, Bishop of Lincoln. Samuel Butler wrote against it 'The Elephant in the Moon' and 'A Satire on the Royal Society,' but these were merely in ridicule of studying such things as the ordinary operations of nature.

CHAP. VIII.

By 'theology' he means 'revelation' as distinguished from natural theology.

sophy,' natural theology, or what we can learn of God apart from the Scriptures. He shows immediately after that the New Testament conceptions of God are purer and more sublime than those of the Pagan philosophers. Then he adds Lord Bacon's distinction, that by reason we may know something of the nature of God, but by revelation we know His will.

The rest of the argument clearly determines that by revelation, or theology, Boyle means what is contained in the books of the Bible. We learn from them that there are angels. To the knowledge of this fact we could never have come by mere reason. The ancient philosophers made the world eternal, and the 'fabulous' Chaldæans supposed it to have been in existence for forty or fifty thousand years. But 'theology' teaches us with certainty that its age is under six thousand, and that it shall be finally destroyed by fire. Boyle refuses to regard the first chapter of Genesis as an allegory, or to condemn those who find in it 'divers particulars in reference to the origin of the world, which, though not *unwarily* or *alone* to be urged in physics, may yet afford considerable hints.'* From mere reason we have no certainty of the immortality of the soul. And even could we prove its immortality, we should still be uncertain if, after the dissolution of the present body, it might not be united to a less perfect organization. But 'theology' reveals what reason could not discover. Sometimes Boyle clearly makes the distinction between revelation and natural theology. At other times they seem to approach each other, and to be only different degrees of the same thing. From his view of revelation we might have concluded that nothing in religion could be known beyond what was already known. Yet he says that by philosophy, the study of Scripture, 'free ratiocination, and dependence on God's Spirit, a far higher knowledge of divine things may be reached than that to which any man has yet attained.'† Reason is to be freely used as the interpreter, both of nature and of revelation. In both of these we may learn something of God. The Old Testament saints did not exclude the study of nature from religion. In the 'Book of Praises,' the psalmist frequently

* P. 22. † P. 51.

lls upon all nature to unite in praise of its great Creator. he study of God in nature and revelation is the beginning f the blessedness of heaven, where the angels continually ehold the face of our heavenly Father. It is by this con-emplation of God that we become like Him. According to ıe saying of Aristotle, we grow to resemble the object of ır meditations, or, as St. John says, 'We shall be like Him, ɔr we shall see Him as He is.'

'The Christian Virtuoso.'

In 'The Christian Virtuoso,' Boyle undertakes to show that, being addicted to experimental philosophy, a man is ıther assisted than indisposed to be a good Christian.' But nportant as physical studies are, the knowledge of incor-oreal and rational beings is incomparably more noble. By xperimental philosophy we have a clear discovery of 'the ivine excellencies displayed in the fabric and conduct of ıe universe.' By it we may learn the existence of Deity. ord Bacon said that God never wrought a miracle to refute theism. His visible works are sufficient for that. When a ıan is convinced of the existence of God, he has then, Boyle ays, 'received the first principle of that natural religion vhich itself is pre-required to revealed religion.'* The tudent of nature may also see that rational souls are ot subject to the law of dissolution which governs bodies. Ie may know that there is a Providence, and by this pre-aration of natural religion, he will be 'strongly inclined o wish for a supernatural discovery of what God would have ım believe and do.'† When a man, by the study of ıature, is thus prepared to receive Christianity, and when ıe has considered the excellency of its doctrines, the miracles vrought in its behalf, and its effects in the world, he will hen, Boyle says, be convinced of its truth. The testimony ɔf miracles is proved to be the testimony of experience, by he same arguments as were used by Bishop Sprat. The xperience is admitted to be 'vicarious,' but on that account is said to be not less certain. Boyle manages this part of he argument with such surpassing ingenuity, that he ɔroves we are certain, by 'theological experience,' that 'the ıtars were made on the fourth day of creation.'

The 'Discourse of Things above Reason,' is in the form of

* P. 14. † P. 40.

CHAP. VIII.

'Discourse of Things above Reason.'

a dialogue. The different speakers discuss the questic with apparent impartiality, sometimes in doubt which sid to take, and sometimes at a loss to determine what may b precisely the meaning of the words 'above reason.' Euge nius says that if nothing more is meant than that there ar things which reason cannot discover without revelation, h would take the side that many things are above reasor But he adds, that if by 'things above reason' be meant suc 'as though delivered in words free from darkness and am biguity, are not to be conceived and comprehended by ou rational faculty, I shall freely confess that I scarce kno what to say upon so unusual and sublime a subject.' Sophronius divides things above reason into three kind: 'the incomprehensible,' 'the inexplicable,' and 'the unsoc able.' The first consists of beings whose nature is not ade quately comprehensible to us, as angels, and above all, Go Himself. We know God by His works, but we cannot fram a 'full and adequate idea of Him.' We know 'that He is but not 'what He is.' In the latter sense, he is 'supra intellectual.' The second includes such things as we kno to exist, but cannot explain how they exist. Of this kin is the infinite divisibility of matter. The third class consist of those things which have attributes irreconcilable wit some known facts. One example of this kind is the coexis tence of free will in man and foreknowledge in God. Euge nius interprets Sophronius' meaning to be that we do nc 'perceive things above reason,' but that we 'perceive thei to be above reason.' He illustrates this by our looking int deep sea. The eye perceives a little way, but discovers no thing more than something dark and indistinct. We cor clude that there may be many things concealed, but tha our sight is unable to reach them. Pyrocles says that things are above our reason, there can be no ground for ou discoursing about them. If our words are not accompanie by clear and distinct perceptions, we only talk like parrots and if they are accompanied by clear and distinct percep tions, the things cannot be incomprehensible. Sophroniu had already anticipated this objection, but he answers i more in detail, from the consideration of distinctions ade

* P. 4.

CHAP. VIII.

uate and inadequate, negative and positive. Our concep-
ons of things above reason may be only indistinct, and yet
ıey may be sufficient for discourse about these things. This
s illustrated by the 'admirably ingenious speculations of
ıathematicians about the affections of surd numbers, and
bout incommensurable magnitudes.'* We have not an
dequate idea of God, and yet we have an idea that repre-
:nts Him as existing, and as more perfect than any other
eing.

The 'Discourse' continued.

The 'Discourse of Things above Reason' is continued in
hat seems to be a second part of the dialogue. This is
alled 'Advices in Judging of Things said to transcend
eason.' A new speaker, called Arnobius, is introduced,
ho is to explain how we are to avoid deceiving ourselves
r being deceived by others when the discourse is of things
bove reason. We are to be sure that the proof is sufficient,
hether it depends on argument or on revelation. We are
ıot to be hasty in rejecting propositions, as if they were
bsurd or impossible, or because we cannot explain the
ıanner how a thing is. The practice of rejecting things
ınintelligible is not to be censured, yet it must be done with
:aution when the things are such as we know to transcend
ur reason. The advice of Arnobius is summed up by
another speaker to the effect that when two propositions are
'aid down, one of which is evident by experience or reason,
ınd the other proved by mathematics or attested by revela-
tion, we are to reject neither of the propositions because we
lo not know how to reconcile them. A superior intellect
that knows the things above our reason may be able to
reconcile what is irreconcilable by us.†

John Locke.

The best representative of the theological spirit of this
age was John Locke. It has become common to regard
Locke as the founder of rational theology in England. But

* P. 83.

† Two of Boyle's religious discourses are interesting as showing the pious spirit of the author, but they throw no further light on his theology. One is 'Of the High Veneration Man's Intellect owes to God,' and the other 'Some Motives and Incentatives to the Love of God.' Lindamor, to whom it is addressed, and who is supposed to represent the author himself, had an unrequited passion for Hermione. He is exhorted to transfer his affection to a nobler object and cultivate seraphic love. The love of God brings no disappointment, and in loving Him we are sure that we love one who loves us.

CHAP. VIII.

this is scarcely correct. Locke said nothing in theolog which had not been said by the most orthodox theologian of the reign of William and Mary. He surpassed them a only by being more thorough. So far as he went wit reason he went equally. He was not rational on one subjec and irrational on another. He did not advocate the claim of reason with the reservation of a background for tradi tional superstition. His reasoning is often so complete tha it carries him logically beyond the position which he wishe to maintain. He applied to the science of mind Bacon' method of observation and experience, and, like Bacon he professed to regard theology as outside of his method Yet Locke did what he professed not to do. He approached theology in the spirit of philosophy, and has given us th clearest evidence of the impossibility of their ultimate sepa ration.

On grounds of certainty.

In the beginning of the 'Essay on the Human Under standing,' Locke says that his object is 'to inquire into th origin, certainty, and extent of human knowledge, togethe with the grounds and degrees of belief, opinion, and assent. This design necessarily compelled him to treat of natura theology, and to say something concerning the grounds o which we receive revelation. It was, he said, an inquiry from which we were to learn both the extent of our capa cities and of our knowledge. The result of the inquiry is that God has given 'whatsoever is necessary for the conve niences of life and information of virtue, and He has put within the reach of our discovery the comfortable provision for this life, and the way that leads to a better.'* This know ledge is admitted to be far short of 'a perfect comprehen sion,' yet it is declared sufficient for our present necessities, and it is all that it has pleased the Divine Being to give us.

Morality eternal.

We have already seen† that Locke's denial of innate ideas was only a denial of the words, and not of the thing intended. He admitted a natural law, but denied that the knowledge of it was 'innate.' Absolute and independent morality existed, Locke said, but it was not evident at first sight. It has to be learned by experience. God has con nected virtue with happiness. It is found to be beneficial to

* Works, p. 4, ed. 1824.

† Vol. I. p. 452.

ociety, and therefore it receives the general approbation of nankind. This is illustrated by the eternal truth that three angles of a triangle are equal to two right angles. This is ternally true, but it is not self-evident. It is not like the axiom that the whole is greater than a part. Yet it can be lemonstrated, and so can moral rules. They are not evi-lent at first sight, but we become certain of them by expe-ience. Our bodies come into the world without clothes, nd our minds without ideas; but we have faculties which nable us to provide both. By the use of these faculties ve may be as certain of the existence of God as that the pposite angles made by the intersection of two straight ines are equal. It was objected that we have the idea of ubstance, which did not come by sensation or reflection. Locke answers that this is a general idea, and that general deas are the creatures or inventions of the understanding. The idea of substance is said to be only a supposition of an unknown support of accidents.

On Locke's system the being of God and the duties of natural religion are as clearly within the reach of man as if the mind were furnished with innate ideas. But the articles of the Christian religion belong to another sphere. They come by revelation. They are received by faith, and have nothing to do with the certainty of knowledge. Revelation depends on the veracity of God. When Locke said on one occasion that the immateriality of the soul could not be proved, it was objected that by this he lessened the credi-bility of its immortality. The objection implied that what is revealed is only to be believed in proportion as it accords with reason. This principle Locke repudiated with emphatic indignation. 'As if,' he exclaimed, 'God were not to be believed on His own word unless what He reveals be in itself credible, and might be believed without Him.' He adds, 'If this be the way to promote religion, the Christian reli-gion, I am not sorry that it is not a way to be found in any of my writings.'* Of the future life nature had some glimmerings, but 'it is established and made certain only by revelation.'† In the chapter on Probability, Locke shows the different value of the grounds on which different

Revelation altogether distinct from natural religion.

* Vol. ii. p. 92.

† Vol. ii. p. 100.

CHAP. VIII.

kinds of probability rest. Things unusual are not so credible as things that are common. When the Dutch ambassador told the King of Siam that in winter in Holland men walked on the water, he answered, 'Now I am sure you lie.' The exception for things extraordinary is 'when supernatural events are suitable to the ends aimed at by Him who has the power to change the course of nature. When God speaks, we are to believe what He says, whether it agrees or disagrees with our experience and the ordinary course of the world. Revelation cannot deceive us. Our assent to it is faith, which properly excludes all doubt. Faith is defined as an assent to a proposition on the credit of the proposer.*

Yet not to be received if it contradicts natural knowledge.

So far Locke is clear in his adherence to Bacon's principle that revelation is beyond the province of science and independent of it. But there is a chasm to be bridged between this abstract revelation and the actual revelation in Christianity. God's veracity is not to be doubted, but we must be certain that it is God who speaks. It is the province of reason to discover the certainty or probability of what is proposed. Christianity is not an immediate revelation. It is only traditional, and proposed to us through the testimony of others. Locke says that those to whom revelation is immediate may have a certainty equal to that of knowledge, but not those who have it through testimony. Noah, who saw the flood, had a greater certainty of it than those who did not see it. If a revelation which is not immediate contradicts our natural knowledge, we are not compelled to yield assent to it. This seems to be a contradiction to what Locke has already said concerning reason and its relations to revelation. But it is repeated in distinct and decided words. 'The natural way of knowledge,' he says, 'is the surest evidence we can have of anything, unless where God immediately reveals it to us; and then too our assurance can be no greater than our knowledge is that it is a revelation from God.'† Again he says, 'We can never receive for truth anything that is directly contrary to our clear and distinct knowledge. We can never assent to a proposition that affirms the same body to be in two distinct places at

* Vol. ii. p. 263.

† Vol. ii. p. 266.

ıce, however it shou'd pretend to the authority of a divine velation.' * In another place Locke says that though the cripture be infallible, yet 'the reader may be—nay, cannot at be—very fallible in the understanding of it.' † The ill of God clothed in words is subject to all the uncerıinty connected with human language and the human unerstanding. Even the Son of God Himself when 'clothed ı human flesh was liable to all the frailties and inconveiences of human nature.' ‡

Locke denies that natural religion is clearer than revealed.

The inference that natural knowledge is more certain than evelation was clearly made by Locke himself. He was eproached with it by his opponents. He did not like the eproach in the form in which it came, and tried to remove t. To do this, he endeavoured to raise what he called the ssurance of faith as near as possible to what he called the ertainty of knowledge. Indeed, he sometimes speaks of aith having 'as much certainty as our knowledge,' defining aith as a 'settled and sure principle of assent and assurance, which leaves no manner of room for doubt or hesitation.' The certainty, however, is evidently of a different kind from hat of knowledge. In a letter to Stillingfleet, Locke says hat 'to talk of the certainty of faith seems all one to me as o talk of the knowledge of believing—a way of speaking not easy to me to understand. Bring faith to certainty and it ceases to be faith. When it is brought to certainty, faith is destroyed; it is knowledge then, and faith no longer.' This subject was discussed by Hooker and Chillingworth in the same connection in which it was forced on Locke. Hooker distinguished between a certainty of evidence and a certainty of adherence. The latter certainty, according to Hooker, was greater than the other. Chillingworth said that, concerning the articles of revealed religion, we can have nothing more than moral certainty. But he added that 'the spirit of obsignation and confirmation' would work in believers 'a certainty of adhesion beyond that certainty of evidence,' and would make them 'as fully and resolutely assured of the Gospel of Christ as those who heard it from Christ Himself with their ears, which saw it with their eyes, which looked upon it, and whose hands handled the Word

* Vol. ii. p. 266. † Vol. ii. p. 21. ‡ *Ib.*

CHAP. VIII.

of Life.' Locke endorses the words both of Hooker an Chillingworth. By what he calls 'assurance' or persuasio he makes up for what faith wants in absolute certainty The sum of the whole seems to be that the truth or certainty of Christianity is not capable of demonstration. The probabilities of its truth are so great as to amount to moral certainty. And if we sincerely and earnestly seek the guidance of the Holy Spirit, we shall have 'the assurance of faith. This is substantially the answer which Laud gave to Fisher and which has been tacitly, but not always consciously admitted by all Protestant theologians.

The 'Reasonableness of Christianity.'

Of the 'Reasonableness of Christianity' we have already spoken.* It was an effort to construct Christianity out of the Scriptures alone, independently of the creeds. No sincere man ever attempted this without coming under the charge of heresy. But, notwithstanding all that has been said against Locke, no man that ever began afresh the entire study of Christianity departed less than he did from received doctrines. The charge of Socinianism or Unitarianism he did not condescend to answer. When asked to clear himself by avowing the Trinity as it was received in the Christian Church, he answered that he had never been charged with denying the Trinity, and that he did not know how it had been always received in the Christian Church. He did not deny that the doctrine of the Trinity might be inferred from the Scriptures. He only said that he could not find in the Bible the precise terms, 'There are three persons in one nature, or there are two natures and one person.'

Locke orthodox on the atonement.

We have already seen that Locke did not deny the atonement in the sense that Christ made satisfaction for the sins of men.† In his notes on St. Paul's Epistles he is satisfied with using the sacrificial language of the Apostle, putting no further meaning upon it than is required by the context. He avoids all theories of the atonement, but takes the death of Christ as a literal price by which men are redeemed, in the same sense as captives are redeemed from slavery. The price is the precious blood of Christ. It was by His death that reconciliation was made. In the 'Reasonableness of Christianity' Locke speaks of Christ having laid down His

* Vol. I. p. 453.

† Vol. I. p. 455.

e for us in a sense which could not be done by one 'who d incurred death by his own transgressions.' In the Second Vindication of the Reasonableness of Christianity' e speaks frequently of Christ having been offered up for ur redemption. He does not say 'satisfaction,' because he ishes to keep to Scripture language. But he does not deny iat what is understood by satisfaction is fairly inferred om the sacrificial language of the Epistles.* To make hrist nothing more than the restorer and preacher of pure atural religion was, Locke said, to do violence to the whole nor of the New Testament.†

There are some other points in Locke's theology which e need not do more than mention here, as they were held lso by some of his contemporaries. Such was the explanaion of Adam's sin, by which he forfeited his right to the ree of life, and so became mortal. This mortality was inheited by all the posterity of Adam, whose existence would ave ceased at death if Christ had not brought life and nmortality to light. Temporal death, or cessation of being, vas the chief result of Adam's transgression. It did not nake him and his posterity subject to 'endless torments in ell-fire,' or place them under the necessity of committing in in every action of their lives. We are restored to immorality by faith in Christ. We are justified 'by believing.' This expression is not in Scripture, and did not escape the ensure of Locke's critics. He said that salvation or perdiion depends upon believing or rejecting this one propoition—'that Jesus is the Messiah.' This was the sum of what the Apostles preached. But these statements, as Locke made them, must be taken in connection with his explanations. The belief of this one article was supposed to be necessarily followed by the belief of other articles. Belief is further explained as including works, so that in the end it is really those who do good that are saved or become immortal, and those who do evil cease to exist. Locke leaves us after raising many questions which we should like that he had tried to answer. He remained avowedly within the pale of the orthodox form of Christianity, but on many subjects he was carried unconsciously beyond the appointed

Cessation of being, the natural result of Adam's sin.

* Vol. vi. p. 418. † Vol. vi. p. 5.

CHAP. VIII.

boundaries. The position was reached which made a further step impossible without either falling into simp Deism or adopting a new interpretation of the meaning Christianity.

Locke's opponents.

Locke's opponents, with the exception of Stillingflee were all unknown to fame. Their books are forgotten, ar their names found only, if found at all, in Locke's answer He treated them with severity, and they had the satisfactic of stinging him into wrath. The best known is Jol Edwards, who wrote 'Some Thoughts concerning the sever Causes and Occasions of Atheism,' and afterwards, 'Soc nianism Unmasked.' In answer to these, Locke wrote h 'Vindication of the Reasonableness of Christianity' and h 'Second Vindication.' Samuel Bolde, Rector of Steeple, Dorsetshire, also wrote against Edwards in defence of Lock The author of a 'Brief Vindication of the Fundament Articles of the Christian Faith' against Locke and Bold found Locke's doctrine of one article of faith in Hobbe 'De Cive.' 'Locke,' he says, 'though infinitely short Hobbes, furbishes up his old ideas. When framing a ne Christianity, he took Hobbes' Leviathan for the New Te tament.' William Carrol convicted Locke of Atheism. I the tenth chapter of the fourth book of the 'Essay on th Human Understanding,' Locke had demonstrated th existence of God. Carrol maintains that Locke has prove nothing, except 'the eternal existence of one cogitative and extended material substance,' which is simply th Deity of Spinoza, from whom the whole of Locke's hypo thesis is said to have been borrowed. The reason of man being a modification of this Deity, is itself divine, and th church 'a society of reasonable men.' The ablest of Locke's adversaries, with the exception of Stillingfleet, was the author of a book called 'An Account of Mr. Locke's Religion out of his own writings and in his own words.'*

* John Norris, Rector of Bemerton, wrote 'Cursory Reflections' on Locke's Essay. He refuted Locke's arguments against innate ideas, adopting as his own hypothesis that of Malebranche, that we 'see all things in God.'

In 1719 the Locke controversy broke out again. Winch Holdsworth preached before the University o Oxford against Locke's view of the resurrection of the body. Holdsworth maintained that the same body would rise again. This sermon was followed a few years later, by a 'Defence,' in which many heresies were charged on Locke, as the denial of an innate notion of God, having taught that the

CHAP. VIII.

Sir Isaac Newton.

Sir David Brewster says that if Sir Isaac Newton had not
een distinguished as a mathematician and natural philo-
pher, he would have enjoyed a high reputation as a theo-
gian. This judgment is founded on Newton's natural
aste for theology. He began in his youth to write theolo-
ical works, to which he returned at intervals in his busy
fe, but which he never found time to bring to perfection.
'is 'Observations on the Prophecies of Daniel and St. John'
ere published a few years after his death. Voltaire spoke
f this work with a sneer, saying that Newton had only
xplained the Revelation as others had done before him.
ir David Brewster, on the other hand, calls the 'Observa-
ions' an ingenious work, 'characterized by great learning,
nd marked with the sagacity of its distinguished author.'
'hese judgments are the results of the different estimates
hich Voltaire and Sir David Brewster made of the inter-
retation of prophecy. The learning displayed in Newton's
ork is not greater than appears in many a similar work of
hich the author has been long forgotten. The 'sagacity'
s nothing more than the often-repeated commonplace con-
erning Scripture prophecies, that they were not given to
ake men prophets, or to acquaint them with events before
hey came to pass. The truth of a prophecy is manifest by
ts fulfilment. Newton said that the interpreters of the
revious age had made such great discoveries in this study
hat he was encouraged to do something in the same way.
t seemed, he adds, that God's time was come for opening
he mysteries of the prophetic Scriptures. The 'little horn'
n Daniel was the Pope, and so was the Apocalyptic beast.
His name was *ΛΑΤΕΙΝΟΣ*, which is the number of a man,
ix hundred and sixty-six; and the mark which he caused

His interpretation of prophecy.

oul sleeps between death and the esurrection, that there is no original orruption of our nature, that Jesus Christ did not make satisfaction for in, that the wicked do not suffer ternal death, and that at the resurrection the same bodies shall not rise gain. Holdsworth was answered with reat ability by Catherine Cockburn, well-known writer of that day. She eproached Holdsworth with a want of prudence in classing Locke among heretics and enemies of our religion. Mrs. Cockburn vindicated Locke's views on all the subjects mentioned, especially on the resurrection of the body. The old creeds, she said, teach that the body will rise again, but they never enter into details as to the nature of that body. St. Paul said it was to be 'spiritual,' and Locke had said nothing more. Mrs. Cockburn, in noticing Stillingfleet's controversy with Locke, said that 'the Bishop was afraid where no fear was.'

CHAP. VIII.

all men to receive in their foreheads was 'the sign of th cross.' It is to be feared that the world generally will agre with Voltaire, that Sir Isaac Newton 'explained the Revel tion in the same manner as those that went before him.'

On the Trinitarian texts.

Another theological treatise by Sir Isaac Newton wa 'An Historical Account of Two Notable Corruptions o Scripture.' The first of these concerned the three witnesses in the First Epistle of St. John, and the other, the words o St. Paul to Timothy, 'God manifest in the flesh,' where the Greek word for 'which' had been changed into the word fo 'God.' On the ground of this treatise, Sir Isaac Newton i supposed not to have been a believer in the doctrine of the Trinity. But this inference is not warranted. He wrote solely in the interests of criticism. The faith, he said, had long subsisted without this text interpolated in St. John' Epistle. The question at issue was not an article of faith. Sir Isaac afterwards showed great anxiety to have this treatise suppressed, but whether because he believed that it contained heresy, or because he feared the terrors of the law against blasphemers of the Trinity, is not easily determined.*

On the Arian controversy.

Sir David Brewster published several of Newton's theological manuscripts which help to shed further light on hi religious opinions. They are sufficient to strengthen th suspicions that Newton did not receive the doctrine of th Trinity as it is generally explained, but they do not show clearly what his own views were. Whiston says Newton inclined to the Baptists and Arians, even supposing them to be the two witnesses in the Apocalypse. The manuscripts are mostly historical, and Newton everywhere shows himself on the side of Arius. He finds Athanasius a persecutor, seditious, and an inventor of evil things. He protests, after the fashion of the authors of 'The Naked Truth,' and 'The Naked Gospel,' against the use of metaphysical terms in Christianity. He doubts if 'Homoousion' was in any creed before the Nicene. He asks if it was not pressed into that creed against the will of the majority of the Council. He supposes that it may have meant nothing more than that

* There is nothing in this treatise which might not have been written by a Trinitarian, but Sir Isaac was Master of the Mint, and even the suspicion of being unsound on this doctrine might have been against him.

ırist was the express image of the Father, and he inti- ates that some of the bishops added the explanation after eir subscriptions, that by Homoousion they meant Homoiısion. All these things are expressed in the form of quesns. One is, whether Hosius, or whoever translated that eed into Latin, did not impose upon the Western Churches translating *ὁμοούσιος* by the words *unius substantiæ* inead of *consubstantialis?* and whether by that translation e Latin churches were not drawn into an opinion that the ather and Son had one common substance, called by the reeks *hypostasis?* The Greeks are supposed to have relled against this as Sabellianism, and in opposition to ve adopted the three hypostases, and thereby subjected emselves to the charge of Arianism. The schoolmen anged the meaning of the word hypostasis, and brought in e notion of three persons in one single substance. From e manuscripts published by Sir David Brewster, it is arcely to be doubted that Newton's views were Arian.

Himself an Arian.

CHAPTER IX.

DR. BURY'S 'NAKED GOSPEL.'—VINDICATION BY LE CLERC.—ANSWER BY NICHOLLS.—THE TRINITARIAN CONTROVERSY.—I SHERLOCK.—DR. WALLIS.—DR. JANE.—THOMAS FIRMIN.—I SOUTH.—JOHN HOWE.—BURNET'S 'THEORY OF THE EARTH.'—BLOUNT'S 'ORACLES OF REASON.'—LESLIE'S 'SHORT AND EA METHOD WITH THE DEISTS.'—GILDON'S 'DEISTS' MANUAL.'—JOHN TOLAND.—CHRISTIANITY NOT MYSTERIOUS.—CONTROVER ON THE CANON OF SCRIPTURE.—SOUTH.—BULL.—BEVERIDG —JOHN NORRIS.—JOHN RAY.

The supremacy of reason.

REASON was the watchword of all English theologians the last two decades of the seventeenth century. Th was true of Sharp, Patrick, and Scott, who were reckon the High Churchmen of their day, as well as of Tillotson a Stillingfleet, Tenison and Burnet. They were not all agre how far they were to go with reason. No limits were fixe nor did any of them suppose that the doctrines which they received were unable to stand the test of reason. They had all abandoned the theology of Calvin, which was now taug only in obscure conventicles.* The efficacy of sacraments, and kindred beliefs, were relegated to the uneducated country clergy, or left as the last solace of the unreasoning Jacobite.

The object generally proposed by this use of reason was the reconstruction of Christianity on its original basis. The

* There were some exceptions, as in the case of Dr. William Jane, who was both a High Calvinist and a High Churchman. South, too, was a Calvinist in doctrine.

CHAP. IX.

r of the age was for the Christianity of Christ and His
ostles. In the work of restoration many errors were
de, which had afterwards to be rectified. The conviction
s universal that Christianity in itself was something very
nple and very reasonable. But how it was to be separated
m traditional theology was not so evident. To do this
s the object of Locke's 'Reasonableness of Christianity.'
shop Croft had the same object in his 'Naked Truth.'
e could not find in Christianity any of the impositions
ich kept Conformists and Nonconformists in eternal strife.
e wished the metaphysical creeds to be removed from the
turgy. They might have been of service in the age that
oduced them, and even now they may have great historical
erest. But Christianity, he said, must be something alto-
ther different from abstract definitions concerning sub-
nces that are inconceivable and essences that are incompre-
nsible. Another book of the same class was 'The Naked
spel,' by 'A True Son of the Church of England.' This
s published anonymously in 1690, but it was known to be
e work of Dr. Arthur Bury, the Master of Lincoln. 'The
ked Gospel' proposed to inquire into the Gospel in its
st simplicity, then into the additions and corruptions of
e Gospel, and lastly into the 'advantages and damages' of
ese additions and corruptions.

'The Naked Gospel.'

The chief feature of the Gospel, as delivered by Christ,
s found to be love to God and love to man. This was
o the sum of natural religion. God has loved us, and
e manifestation of that love in Christ is a perpetual obli-
tion on us to love mankind. It was also found that
hristianity corrected the errors of natural religion. It
culcated a more rational worship. It proposed, as the end
religious service, not banquets and feasts, but inward joy
d peace. The doctrines of the Gospel, Dr. Bury says, are
mmed up in two precepts—believe and repent. Some-
nes they are included under the one article of faith in
hrist. In the sermon on the mount there is no mention of
pentance. In Christ's last sermon He said that the object
His death and resurrection was that repentance and
mission of sins should be preached in His name among all
tions. The virtue of repentance is sometimes in Scripture

The gospel is mainly love to God and man.

CHAP. IX.

ascribed to faith. It is said that whosoever believeth sh not perish but have everlasting life. So far, Dr. Bury say is our Lord from thinking His Gospel honoured by mul plication of articles, that, rather than keep up that least numbers, He is willing to dismiss either of the two. The are described as the two tables of the new covenant. Wh joined they appear two, but when closed they are only on The positive rites of Christianity are excluded from a place as parts of the new covenant. They are badges Christ's disciples and acknowledgments of their homage His person.

Faith means obedience.

This faith which includes repentance is called justifyi faith. To them that believed Christ promised eternal lif Dr. Bury adds that in all such promises there were ma things implied, though not always expressed. Christ alwa meant by faith such a faith as led to a new life. The law nature intimates as much as this, and the Gospel was n given to obscure the law of nature, but to make it mo legible. St. Paul promised safety in the shipwreck, b only on condition that the sailors abide in the ship. Fai is not to be confounded with credulity. There is no mer in mere believing without a sufficient cause for faith. It said of the simple that he 'believeth every word, but t wise man looketh well to his goings.' Faith is an act reason. It is not a doctrine peculiar to the Gospel, but w taught and commended previous to the institution of pos tive religion. The faith of Abraham is set forth in Scri ture as a pattern to Christians. This, Dr. Bury says, w founded on reason, which is itself the voice of God. Abra- ham was willing to sacrifice Isaac, because he knew that God was infinite in wisdom, power, and truth, and therefo able to raise Isaac again from the dead. The command Abraham was contrary to what his natural conscience tol him was right, but he knew by immediate revelation that was the command of God, and therefore his obedience w rational. Faith is explained to be a natural duty, and many reasons are given why in Christianity it took the form faith in Christ. It was loyalty to the King of the spiritu kingdom. To have faith in Him was difficult, because H came in lowliness and not as the Jews expected Him. T

rofess faith in Christ was dangerous, but it was necessary
›r the triumph of His cause. To be a Christian is simply
› follow Christ, to take Him for our guide, as the sun in
ıe heavens is a guide to the traveller.

With this illustration we come at once to the main idea of The Naked Gospel.' It was a protest against speculation oncerning the person of Christ, that subject being beyond ur capacities. It might have been enough to have pro-›sted against imposing the results of speculation as articles f faith, but the protest really is against the speculation self. The mode of the incarnation, Dr. Bury says, is not a art of the Christian faith. The traveller finds the sun a ıfficient guide without knowing the origin and nature of ›lar light. In the same way Christ is a sufficient guide to he Christian without the knowledge of the mystery of His eing. From the history of the contentions concerning the ıanner in which Christ was God, it is maintained that the peculation is positively injurious to Christianity. Constan-ne wisely sent to the chiefs of the contending parties in is day a gracious letter persuading them to peace. He told ıem that it was 'a silly question, more fit for fools and hildren than for wise men.' Dr. Bury says it is a question impertinent to the design of Christianity, fruitless and angerous.' The sun does not seek the praise of the philo-›pher, neither does Christ. He arose with healing in His ›ings, to give life and health to a dying world. Those to hom His Gospel was chiefly to be preached were unable to ave faith in the deep things of His Godhead. The first onverts were asked simply to believe that Jesus Christ was he Son of God, the long-expected Messiah. The curiosity ' the learned increased in the next age, and they made ›nsiderable progress in explaining the mysteries. Yet ustin Martyr testifies that in his day all Christians did not elieve in the Godhead of Christ. This article of faith was ot then imposed on the Church. Leonas, who was sent by onstantius to moderate in the Council of Seleucia, found he bishops 'very free' on this subject, and he told them to go and play the fool at home.'

Speculation concerning the incarnation not necessary, and dangerous.

Dr. Bury, continuing his illustration from the sun, says ıat if we gaze on it with too steady a view, it will show

CHAP. IX.

nothing but the weakness of our eyes. He argues as if ca had been taken in the Scriptures to conceal from us th real nature of Christ's incarnation. Even His human gen ration is concealed. The two genealogies cannot be reco ciled. The Scribes said truly, when Christ cometh no ma knoweth whence He is. The prophet of old asked, wh shall declare His generation, and the Bishop of Alexandri answered, 'I will.' He expounded the eternal generatio of the Son with such deep learning and refined subtletie that Arius was confounded. The heretic cavilled, and wa banished by the Council of Nice. At last the Emperc was convinced that there was really no difference betwee the creed of Arius and the creed of the Council whic sent him into exile. Theodosius tried to settle the disput by forbidding any one to contradict the Bishops of Rom and Alexandria. Afterwards the question of the Godhea of the Son was decided in a sense opposed to that of th Council of Nice. Athanasius made the divine nature com mon to Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as the human natur is common to Peter, James, and John. It was conclude that the three were one, because they had but one mind They were of the same substance in the sense that a bisho a priest, and a deacon are of the same substance. Agains this the schoolmen rebelled. They tried to distinguis between a person and a 'suppositum rationale.' But the could not do this, even to their own satisfaction, and so the took refuge in the impregnable castle of mystery. Like transubstantiation, it was all a mystery, and if it is, Dr. Bury asks, why do we still go on disputing about it?

The Gospel independent of the speculations.

The Gospel is described as independent of all these deep and distracting questions. What it requires for salvation is within the reach of the meanest capacity. It was instituted to elevate man's life, to give him fellowship with God, and to make him a partaker of the divine nature. But all this has been reversed by the learned doctors of the Church. Faith, which at best is but a retainer of holiness, is placed on an absolute throne. The Gospel has given place to metaphysics. St. Paul said that what he preached was so plain that it could not be hid except to those whose eyes were blinded by the god of this world. Of the Gospel which is

CHAP. IX.

eached now it may be said, as Aristotle said of the science which it is moulded, 'it is so published as not to be pub-ished.' Some modern doctrines which pass as essentials of ristianity Dr. Bury describes as more absurd than the athen follies exposed by the ancient Fathers. The effect this on the world is not love, peace, and joy, but hatred, ibulation, and strife.

Le Clerc vindicates 'The Naked Gospel.'

'An Historical Vindication of The Naked Gospel,' as-ibed to Le Clerc, and recommended to the University of xford, was published the same year. The corruptions of hristianity are here traced to Paganism. The doctrine of ie Trinity was borrowed from Plato, who speaks of God ider the three phases of Being, Reason, and Spirit. The ifferent modifications of this Trinity are found among the ter Platonists. The double meaning of the world hypo-asis is found in Plotinus. Sometimes it means a person, nd at other times a substance. The same ambiguity roubled the orthodox Christians, some of whom spoke of hree hypostases in the Divine Being, while others admitted nly one. This difference among the Platonists about the ieaning of hypostasis is noticed by Cyril of Alexandria. e Clerc says that they certainly handled the subject with reat subtlety. Augustine expressed his conviction that if he Platonists were to rise again, they would freely embrace hristianity, only changing a few words and opinions. ustin Martyr says that the opinion of Plato was not much ifferent from that of Christ; and Clemens of Alexandria ientions Plato as an advocate of the Trinity. These Fathers eckoned it to the praise of Christianity that it was so much agreement with the wisdom of the Greeks. But Le Clerc ays they would have done better had they kept to the anguage of the New Testament. The subject of the Trinity vas so obscure that Arius could cite as many authorities rom the ancient philosophers as Athanasius. 'This,' Le lerc adds, 'is the effect of equivocal terms, which were ntroduced into Christianity without well defining them, and he bad custom of most of the ancients, who never spoke almly of these matters, and who thought of nothing less han of explaining themselves clearly.'

'The Naked Gospel' was burned by a decree of the Univer-

CHAP. IX.

William Nicholls refutes 'The Naked Gospel.'

sity of Oxford. It was then answered by William Nicholl a fellow of Merton College.* It consisted, Nicholls said, two heads: 'that the disputes about the Trinity have bee the decaying of Christianity; and that this doctrine is cor trary to the simplicity of the gospel.' Dr. Bury had cer tainly opposed the ecclesiastical Trinity, which professe to be a mystery and a contradiction. This Trinity Nichol maintained to be consistent with the simplicity of the Chri tian religion. It could, he said, be understood as far a was necessary for faith, by a man of the humblest capacity In revelation we expect mysteries, which are to be receive and not questioned. Reason was insufficient, and therefor revelation was given. To show that the highest reaso could never reach the teaching of the New Testament Nicholls quoted many ancient writers. Aristotle said tha it was only becoming a slave to bear injury without seekin revenge. Cicero regarded revenge as one of the rights c nature. To Atticus he says, 'I hate the man, and will hat him, and wish I could be revenged of him.' Concernin faith, Nicholls says that Dr. Bury is in this dilemma—eithe we believe what is reasonable and so we cannot help it, o we believe without reason and so we are fools. A faith tha can justify must be an orthodox faith. It is justifying simply because it is such a faith as God requires. It ha no merit, and means grace in opposition to works. It i outside the sphere of reason. The schoolmen properly called it an 'infused habit,' an inspiration from God. The faith of Abraham was an 'inspired virtue excited in him by the preventing and co-operating grace of God.' It was formal Christian faith. The patriarchs believed in Christ, without this they could not have been saved. Belief in Christ's divinity is a necessary part of saving faith. Nicholls adds that the decisions of General Councils are not to be despised. They are the expressions of the judgment of great and good men. The ground of this argument is that God

* 'An Answer to an Heretical book called "The Naked Gospel," which was condemned and ordered to be publicly burnt by the Convocation of the University of Oxford, August 19, 1690. With some Reflections on Dr. Bury's New Edition of that book. To which is added a Short History of Socinianism. By William Nicholls, M.A., Fellow of Merton College, in Oxford, 1690.' It was also answered by Thomas Long.

will not suffer the representatives of His Church to err in any important matter of faith.

Beginning of the great Trinitarian controversy.

The great Trinitarian controversy, which absorbed the theological mind during the last ten years of the seventeenth century, began about the time of the publication of 'The Naked Gospel.' Its beginnings were in obscurity with anonymous pamplets, but contemporary history connects them with the name of Thomas Firmin, a wealthy London merchant. Firmin was a friend of Tillotson's, indeed a friend and helper of all the clergy in the city of London, equally famous for his extensive benevolence and his zeal in the propagation of Unitarian opinions. He was born at Ipswich, and had been educated by his parents in the strictest principles of Puritanism. In the time of the Commonwealth he came to London as an apprentice. His master was a worshipper at John Goodwin's church in Coleman Street. Firmin went to church with his master every Sunday, and under the influence of Goodwin's arguments he exchanged the theology of Calvin for that of Arminius. After a few years Firmin was in business for himself. His means at first were small, but he opened his house to all ministers of religion and encouraged them in works of benevolence. Among his visitors was John Bidle, who resided with him for some time before Bidle was banished by Cromwell to the Isle of Scilly. Bidle convinced Firmin that the unity of God is a unity of person as well as of nature, that the Holy Ghost is indeed a person but not God. By the time of the Restoration, Firmin had prospered in business. In 1660 he married a citizen's daughter with what seems to have been considered a large dowry, even five hundred pounds. After the restoration of the Episcopal Government, he continued to conform to the Established Church on the principle that ceremonies and forms of Church government are merely the circumstantials of religion, and in themselves indifferent. The leading Conformist clergy, who at this time filled the pulpits of the city churches, had been educated among the Puritans and had conformed on the same principle. Such were Whichcot, Wilkins, Worthington, Tillotson, and Firmin's own minister in Lombard Street, William Outram.

CHAP. IX.

Thomas Firmin's tracts.

The tracts on the Unitarian side during the whole of this controversy are said to have been published at Firmin's expense. The first two were called 'A Brief History of the Unitarians' and 'Brief Notes on the Athanasian Creed.' The 'Brief History' explained the chief doctrines of the Unitarians. Jesus was called 'the Messenger, Minister, and Creature of God.' He was 'the Son of God,' because He had been conceived by the Holy Ghost. Many texts were quoted to prove the inferiority of the Son to the Father. The Holy Ghost was not a person, as Bidle had maintained, but the power and inspiration of God. The tract recounted in a style much favoured by Unitarians the great names that had been on their side. Erasmus is said to have been an Arian and Grotius a Socinian. Petavius is quoted as pronouncing all the ante-Nicene Fathers to have been Unitarians. Sandius was not an Arian, yet he wrote an ecclesiastical history to show that all antiquity was Arian.

The chief point in the other tract was the advocacy of the principle that a good life and not a right opinion as to controverted doctrines is necessary to salvation. He that uses reasonable diligence to find the truth is not, it is said, to be blamed if he errs. The creed condemns those who do not keep the doctrine of the Trinity and the incarnation 'whole and undefiled.' This, the author says, condemns the Greek Church, which rejects the 'Filioque.' The Greeks laugh at the creed of St. Athanasius, and say that the saint was drunk when he made it. As the Trinity, in the sense of this creed, is not the doctrine of the whole Church, it is asked how it can be the Catholic faith? It certainly was not so in the time of Athanasius. He was condemned as a heretic by three hundred bishops in the Council of Milan, and again by five hundred and forty bishops in the Council of Ariminum. For the history of the doctrine before and after these councils, the writer refers to the works of Sandius. He denies that one God can be three persons, any more than a man can be three persons. When the creed says, 'So there is one Father,' it ought logically to have said, 'So there are three Fathers,' and when it says 'None is afore or after other,' it is contradicted by the Nicene Creed, which calls the Son 'God *of* God.' If the Father gave godhead to the

The Athanasian creed not Catholic.

ion, He must have been before the Son. The writer accepts John Bidle's doctrine, that Jesus was the Son of God in virtue of the miraculous conception by the Holy Ghost. He is also decided in maintaining the infallibility of the Scriptures. Whatever the Scriptures say is to be believed, however much it may contradict reason.

Sherlock on the Trinity.

These two tracts were answered by Dr. Sherlock in 'A Vindication of the Holy and Ever Blessed Trinity and the Incarnation of the Son of God.' Sherlock, like all the divines of his time, contended earnestly for the supremacy of reason, and on this ground he fought the Unitarians. The Trinity he maintained to be a rational doctrine. It was no contradiction, but as for Socinianism it was 'the most stupid senseless heresy that ever infested the Christian Church.' The doctrine of the Trinity, Sherlock said, was altogether unlike the favourite dogma of the Church of Rome. It does not say that at the same time a thing is and is not. It does not say that a body is in heaven and also on earth; or that a crumb of bread can cover a body of ordinary dimensions. It is impossible, according to Sherlock, for us to determine what is contrary to the nature of spirit. We do not know what a spirit is, much less an infinite Spirit like God. We do not perfectly understand anything that is. We know properties but not essences. As to the common divine nature, the Son is equal to the Father; but as to relation and order, inferior to the Father. This, it is said, is no contradiction, and this is the distinction clearly maintained in the Athanasian creed.

Makes saving faith belief in the Athanasian creed.

Dr. Sherlock declared, even with vehemence, that the Catholic faith is necessary to salvation, and that the doctrine of the Athanasian creed is the Catholic faith. Without this a virtuous and godly life can be of no avail. Good men 'may be damned for heresy.' Scripture tells us that without faith justification is impossible; and what, Sherlock asks, can that faith be but the faith of the Catholic Church? No faith can be necessary to salvation if the Catholic faith is not necessary. We are not saved by works but by the Catholic faith. Baptism, by which we are incorporated into the body of Christ, is only administered to adult persons on condition of faith, and without this faith

CHAP. IX.

there can be no salvation. With Sherlock these words did not mean nothing. He accepted the legitimate inference from them that 'neither Jews, Turks, nor heathens, none but believing Christians are in a state of salvation, however morally virtuous their lives may be.' To maintain the contrary was but, he said, to make the Christian religion a new and more perfect sect of philosophy than had existed before. Faith in the Trinity is necessary to baptism, and baptism is necessary to salvation; therefore the inference of the creed is just, 'He that does not thus think of the Trinity without doubt shall everlastingly perish.'

How we are to think of the Trinity Dr. Sherlock explains in harmony, as he supposes, with the Athanasian creed. The three persons are not in 'one numerical substance' but in 'one undivided substance,' nor 'three divided persons in this one undivided substance, but three persons which may be three and yet not divided, but intimately united to each other in one undivided substance.' The Divine essence or substance is 'numerically one' as there is but one God. The difficulty is how three distinct substantive persons can subsist in one undivided essence. 'I will not,' Sherlock says, 'pretend to fathom such a mystery as this, but only to show that there is nothing absurd in it.' What is it which constitutes the numerical oneness of a finite created spirit, which has no parts or dimensions? The answer is 'self-consciousness.' One spirit is not conscious of the thoughts and passions of another spirit. But if three spirits were conscious of each other's thoughts and passions as each is of its own, they might then be said to be numerically one. In that case each spirit would be as much one with the other as it is with itself. This, it is suggested, may help us to understand 'the great and venerable mystery of a Trinity in Unity.' The three divine persons are three infinite minds, really distinct from each other. The Father is not the Son, nor is the Son the Holy Ghost, yet Jesus said, 'I and my Father are one.' John wrote his gospel to prove that Jesus was the eternal Son of God,—His Logos, Wisdom, or Reason. In the same gospel there is a prayer in which Jesus asks that all His disciples might be one with Him as He is one with the Father. This unity, according to Dr. Sherlock,

Three persons but one substance

is not the same as the other. Between the Father and the Son there is a perfect harmony, 'resulting from their being in one another.' But such a union being supposed impossible between God and man, it is concluded that the union of the disciples is only a moral union. It resembles the unity of the Godhead, but it is not the same. Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are three distinct infinite persons or minds. They are not mere powers or faculties of the same Being, but three intelligent Beings. Homoousion, according to Patavius, did not mean with the old Fathers a numerical oneness, but a oneness of specific nature. To the same effect Gregory of Nyssa is quoted, saying that it is improper to call three persons as Peter, James, and John three men. They have but one humanity, one specific nature. As there is one humanity in Peter, James, and John, so there is, Sherlock says, one 'Godhead in the three persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.' The difficulty is no difficulty to those who can contemplate God as a simple act or energy.

Dr. Wallis on the Trinity.

In the same year, 1690, Dr. John Wallis published the first of his 'Letters on the Trinity.' Wallis had been educated at Cambridge under Whichcot, and was suspected of Latitudinarianism, but he had devoted his life to mathematics rather than to theology. In a 'Letter to a Friend' he briefly explained the doctrine of 'the Ever Blessed Trinity in opposition to Arians, Socinians, and all anti-Trinitarians.' He showed that the doctrine of the Trinity was no contradiction, but a doctrine explicable to reason. Taking the words of Scripture he found three persons distinctly mentioned, distinguished from each other, and to each of whom Divinity was ascribed. And yet he said it is agreed on all sides that there is but one God. The three persons were the Father, who was said to beget, the Son, who was said to be begotten, and the Holy Ghost, who was said to 'proceed.' It is admitted that we do not understand the distinctions of the three persons, nor even what is meant by the things predicated of each person; that, in fact, person when applied to Deity is not the same as when applied to man. The Socinians, Dr. Wallis says, refuse to believe the Trinity because it is supposed to be inconsistent with natural reason. They do not openly reject the authority of

CHAP. IX.

the Scriptures, but they put a forced meaning on the word which changes the sense. Our business is to inquire if the doctrine be possible, and then if it be true. It is shown that it is not impossible. There are three 'somewhats, commonly called 'persons,' and these are one God. The word 'person' is applied to God only once in the Scriptures,* and that plainly not in the same sense in which we speak of a man as a person. 'It is enough for us if these may be so distinguished as that one be not the other and yet all but one God.' This is illustrated by a cubical body which has three dimensions, length, breadth, and height, and yet the body is but one. To be, to know, and to do, are three things distinct from each other, and yet it is the same soul which is, which knows, and which acts. Dr. Wallis defended the doctrine of the Trinity as explained in the Athanasian creed, but he did not think the damnatory clauses had regard to every particular in the explication.

Dr. Jane answers Dr. Wallis.

Dr. William Jane addressed, through a mutual friend, a letter to Dr. Wallis concerning this explanation of the Trinity. He expressed fears that the school Trinitarians would not be satisfied with his definition of personality as simply that by which the three persons were distinguished. He mentioned that Dr. Sherlock had called them 'three separate minds or beings,' and had pronounced all theories opposed to his to be heresy and nonsense. Dr. Jane approved in the main of Dr. Wallis's illustrations and comparisons, but he showed that it was never said of one dimension of a cube that it is a cube, whereas it is said of each person in the Trinity that He is God. He concluded with an exhortation not to spin cobwebs out of our own bowels, but to be content with what is revealed to us in Scripture concerning these mysteries.

Dr. Wallis answered that this really was his design. He did not determine what a person or a personality is. He simply used the words to express a difference which he could not define. In a third letter he explained and vindicated the Athanasian creed, adding a postscript concerning an answer to his first letter. This answer was one of Firmin's tracts. It professed to be an answer by Dr.

* Heb. i. 3.

Dr. Wallis answered by a Unitarian.

Wallis's friend. He had shown Dr. Wallis's letter to a gentleman, reputed a Unitarian or Socinian, in the expectation that it would convert him, but it had no such effect. Dr. Wallis, he said, had entirely misrepresented their doctrines. In the first place they did not reject the plain testimony of the Scriptures when it seemed inconsistent with natural reason. This was shown from Socinus, Schlichtingius, and Smalcius, who all declare expressly that reason being fallible Scripture is the only sure guide. Dr. Wallis, the writer said, had only quoted two texts for the Trinity, and one of them was that in John concerning the three witnesses, which had been rejected by the most learned Trinitarians. The other was the formula of baptism in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. But it was said of the Israelites that they were baptized into Moses, yet from this it was not to be inferred that Moses was a person of the Godhead. It was maintained against Dr. Wallis, that the Trinity in the time of the Council of Nice was not merely numerical, but really meant three persons united in one Deity. The illustration from the cube was unfairly ridiculed. It was only an illustration, and not meant for more than to show the possibility of three things being one in some other respect than that in which they are three. To this answer was added a postscript animadverting on Dr. Wallis's answer to Dr. Jane, and showing that between the person of God and the person of Christ Scripture did make a marked distinction. The one is called the only true God the Father, and the other Jesus Christ whom the Father hath sent.

By an Arian.

Dr. Wallis's 'Third Letter' was answered in a pamphlet called 'An Answer to Dr. Wallis's Three Letters concerning the Doctrine of the Trinity.' This was written by an Arian, who dwelt chiefly on the impossibility of three being one. Dr. Wallis answered it in a 'Fourth Letter,' which was followed by 'Observations on the Four Letters of John Wallis,' in Firmin's series, professedly by the author of the former tracts. He denies that the Socinians ever refused to admit that what is but one in one respect may be three in another. Their objection to the Trinity is that it is not in the Scriptures. It is not said one is three or that three is one. Dr.

CHAP. IX.

Wallis's 'somewhats' are again ridiculed, and he is rallied with teaching that for salvation it is necessary to believe 'nobody knows what.' Dr. Sherlock's explanation is examined, and his three 'infinite minds' placed over against Dr. Wallis's three 'nothings.' The persons are not persons, the distinctions are only names, and in this sense the writer says the Socinians are as much Trinitarians as Dr. Wallis professes to be. The Unitarians are again defended by numerous quotations from the charge of denying the authority of Scripture, or in any way seeking to make it bend to natural reason.

The 'Arian' vindicated himself against Dr. Wallis's 'Fourth Letter,' and was answered in a Fifth. These were both very short, and contained nothing of any interest. In a 'Sixth Letter' Dr. Wallis answered the 'Observations' on the first four letters. He defended his illustrations, still maintaining that the Trinity was no contradiction, but a principle of reason admitted by Socinians as well as by Trinitarians. The favourite Socinian argument was that the Father alone is God, on the ground of the text, 'to know Thee the only true God.' To this Dr. Wallis answers, that to say the Son or the Holy Ghost is not God, because the Father is the only true God, is like saying that because the God of Abraham is the true God, therefore the God of Isaac or Jacob is not the true God. It is shown, moreover, that of all men the Socinians have the least ground for calling the Father the only true God. He was not the Father on their theory till Christ was born into the world. The name God therefore does not belong to Him as Father but as God.

Dr. Wallis defends himself.

Dr. Jane wrote a second letter to Dr. Wallis, in which he professed to receive the Trinity as Sherlock meant it, but not the terms by which Sherlock explained it. Three 'beings really distinct,' were, he said, in the plain language of reason, three essences. If they are distinct, as Peter, James, and John are distinct, then they can only be one, as Peter, James, and John are one. If they are three substantial beings, they must be three substances. Sherlock calls them spirits, and a spirit is a substance in the sense of the creeds and of Heb. i. 3. That three substances should be

Dr. Jane receives Sherlock's view of the Trinity, but rejects his explanations.

distinct, each of them God, and yet but one God, is contrary to our ideas of number. They may be in union, but that is not unity. The soul and the body are united. The human soul of Christ was in personal or hypostatical union with the Logos, but this union did not make them one substance. To affirm 'three infinite minds' to be only one God, seems to be saying and unsaying the same thing with the same breath. The Athanasian Creed is very guarded. It gives the number 'three' only to the persons, not three 'Eternals,' nor three 'Incomprehensibles,' nor three 'Almightys.' Dr. Jane says that all this is the evident conclusion of our faculties. What there may be in the infinite nature which is beyond us, he will not undertake to determine; but where our faculties are at a loss we should keep to the words of Scripture. The nexus of self-consciousness by which Dr. Sherlock makes the three one, Dr. Jane thinks insufficient. If a good and bad angel were made mutually conscious of one another's thoughts, they would not thereby become one. If the hypothesis were pressed to its logical conclusion, it would come, Dr. Jane says, to three gods or a hypostatical union of three divine spirits. Dr. Jane recommended care not to impose our inferences with the same rigour as we ought to do revealed truth. 'The angels,' he added, 'it may be, think us as foolish and ridiculous for pursuing these notions, as we think ourselves wise and learned in such pursuits.' Dr. Wallis replied in a seventh letter, expressing his entire agreement with Dr. Jane. He did not like Sherlock's expressions, but, instead of writing against them, he preferred explaining the Trinity as it seemed explicable to himself. The distinction between the persons, he said, was more than notional, or that of different attributes; but it is not a distinction of three Gods. Dr. Jane wrote a third letter, in which he explained that by keeping to the Scriptures he did not mean not exercising our judgment, but recognizing the necessary limits of our faculties.

South answers Sherlock.

Sherlock was specially answered by Dr. South, who wrote 'Animadversions upon Dr. Sherlock's book entitled "A Vindication of the Ever Blessed Trinity."' He promised in the title-page to vindicate this article of the Christian faith from Sherlock's 'new notions and false explications.' South

CHAP. IX.

dedicated his book 'to Sherlock's admirers,' and in wha was supposed to be commendable wit in an orthodox divine 'to himself the chief of them!' South hated Sherlock foi many things. He hated him for taking the oaths, though South himself did not cast in his lot with the Jacobites, and he hated him for writing against Calvinism in the treatise on 'The Knowledge of Christ.' That treatise, South said, was so 'fraught with vile and scandalous reflections upon God's justice with reference to Christ's satisfaction that it might pass for a blasphemous libel on both.' Sherlock, in his zeal for natural religion, had said that without revelation men would have concluded the divine forgiveness. South, who was as orthodox as he was scurrilous, called this 'a gross paradox and a scurvy blow at all revealed religion.' He pronounces the doctrine of satisfaction in its grossest form to be the doctrine of the Church—the form in which Sherlock called it 'God's truckling and bartering with sin and the devil for His glory.' At these words the pious soul of the orthodox John Owen was horrified, and the facetious Dr. South rejoicingly participated in the Puritan's horror.

Mystery defined.

In the preface, South gives a definition of mystery. He calls it 'a truth revealed by God, above the power of natura reason to discover.' This definition is said to exclude everything which might be called an absurdity or a contradiction The revelation of a mystery is described as the announcement of something that is mysterious, but not as the explanation of it. The Trinity, therefore, though a revealed doctrine, is not explicable to reason. Sherlock's argument was that unless we comprehend the thing of which we speak, it is impossible for us to say what is or what is not a contradiction. This word 'comprehend' probably meant more than Sherlock intended. He had already said that there was nothing which we could perfectly understand, and yet he had argued against transubstantiation, on the ground that we know the nature of body. He seems to have meant the same thing by knowing as by comprehending, and to have regarded them as different from understanding perfectly. South made a distinction between knowing and comprehending. We can know God, he said, but we cannot comprehend Him, that is we cannot know him in every respect. Sher-

ɔck was not a Latitudinarian, yet by occasional bounds he vent beyond the most pronounced of the Latitudinarians. His Trinity was explicable to reason, yet it came, he said, rom the Scriptures and not from the schools. He preached against philosophy and the corruptions it had introduced into Christianity. Like the author of 'The Naked Gospel,' ıe pleaded for Scripture terms only. On this subject we cannot reconcile Sherlock with himself. He denounced philosophy, and yet he advocated the rights of reason. He even said that he would not believe the gospel if it contradicted reason. He renounced philosophical explanations of the Trinity, but only that he might give a philosophical explanation of the Trinity. South maintained that reason had the same difficulties with Scripture terms as with the terms borrowed from philosophy. Truth and wisdom in their ultimate or absolute ground were as incomprehensible as essence and substance. The use, therefore, of philosophical terms may help us to understand the Trinity so far as it is knowable to the human mind.

Being, South defines as that which is; essence, that by which a thing is what it is; existence, that mode of being by which a thing stands actually produced; and subsistence, as a mode of being by which a thing exists by itself. Each person in the Trinity has the same individual existence as well as one and the same essence, and yet its own proper distinct subsistence. In a created person subsistence and bare essence make a composition, but in the divine nature there is unity by an incomprehensible conjunction. Here, then, we may have three persons or subsistences with one essence. South's Trinity is identical with that of Dr. Wallis. Sherlock said that all we could know of the divine essence is that God is an infinite mind. South answered that if this be all, then God is not a substance, and if not a substance He is nothing. Sherlock said that self-consciousness constituted personality. South answered that it presupposed personality. The human nature of Christ, he said, is perfectly conscious of all its internal acts and yet it is not a person. The soul of man, separate from the body, is self-conscious; but without the body it is not a person. It requires the whole man to constitute a person. 'The rea-

Person defined.

CHAP. IX.

sonable soul and human flesh is one man.' Now, if sel consciousness is not the formal reason of personality in man it cannot be the formal reason of the personality of th divine persons. Sherlock's hypothesis, according to South, was unknown to the Fathers and the schoolmen. If it were true, it would be as valid for proving three thousand persons as three. To this Sherlock could only answer that thre was the number of persons mentioned in the Scriptures, and his object was to show how the three might be one.

While this controversy was going on between Sherloc and South, Thomas Firmin and his friends published 'A Second Collection of Tracts, disproving the Doctrine c Three Almighty and Equal Persons, Spirits, Modes, Substances, or Somewhats in God; and of the Incarnation.'*

Different forms of the Trinity.

The most important tract in this collection was called 'Considerations on the Explications of the Doctrine of the Trinity by Dr. Wallis, Dr. Sherlock, Dr. South, Dr. Cudworth, and Mr. Hooker; as also on the account given by those that say the Trinity is an unconceivable and inexplicable mystery.' This tract was written by the author of the 'Observations o Dr. Wallis's Four Letters.' He repeats what he had sai before, that Dr. Wallis really was a Socinian without knowin it, and that the Socinians were willing to accept the Trinity as explained by him. And yet Dr. Wallis abuses Socinus, with 'his dear and close friends, the Unitarians,' as heretics. The University of Oxford, and many learned Trinitarians, had approved his doctrine. But a Trinity of attributes cannot be a Trinity of persons. God in three relations is but one person, not three. The writer, taking Dr. Wallis's words, that God is three persons in the different offices of Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier, maintains that this is not the old orthodox Trinity. That Trinity was from all eternity. The Athanasian Creed said 'co-eternal;' the Nicene, 'before all worlds.' But the works of creation, redemption, and sanctification fall within the bounds of time. Sherlock's Trinity, the writer says, is taken from Descartes, and consists of three infinite minds. Cudworth's is that of Plato, three divine co-eternal persons, of whom the second

* It is probable that these tracts were collected into volumes. were published separately before they

and third are inferior to the first. South's Trinity was that of Aristotle, which attributed to the divine persons the same numerical substance. It was revived by Peter Lombard, accepted by the Fourth Lateran Council, and has been received as Catholic by all Popes since Innocent III. Hooker's Trinity was one of 'properties.' The substance of God, with the property 'to be of none,' was the Father. With the property 'to be of the Father,' the same substance was the Son. And with the property of 'proceeding from other two,' it was the Holy Ghost. To these is added the 'mystical Trinity,' or that which refuses explication under the name of mystery. The writer again sums them up in this fashion. Dr. South's explication is 'an absurd Socinianism.' Dr. Wallis's 'an ingenious Sabellianism,' which differs from Unitarianism only in words. Dr. Sherlock's is 'a flat Tritheism.' Dr. Cudworth's 'a modified Arianism.' Hooker's 'a Trinity, not of persons, but of contradictions.' The last is the Trinity of the vulgar. For want of another name, it is called Samaritanism. They worship they know not what.

South's view that of the schoolmen.

The 'Considerations' were answered by John Howe in 'A Calm and Sober Inquiry concerning the Possibility of a Trinity in the Godhead.' Howe avoids many questions raised in the 'Considerations,' keeping close to the thesis of the possibility of a Trinity in the Godhead. He declines also all discussion about the indefinite word 'person.' It is regarded as defensible, but, as it is not found in Scripture, its use is not imperative. The Scriptures speak of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost in the Godhead. A true distinction must be admitted, otherwise they cannot be three. We cannot determine what may be contained in the divine nature consistently with its unity and simplicity. That nature in its fulness is beyond our faculties. But in the creature we have 'prints and characters' of the all-perfect Creator. We find in ourselves three natures, 'the vegetative, sensitive, and the intellective,' and yet we 'have but one human nature.' Again, we have a mind and a body, a somewhat that thinks 'and a somewhat that cannot think.' These two are sufficiently distinct, and yet they are one man. If God can unite a body and a soul into one man,

John Howe on the Trinity

CHAP. IX.

why may not two spirits be united? And if two, why nc three? Spinoza had shown that the unification of spirit was easier than that of bodies and minds. Howe does nc care for Spinoza. The theological pantheist had no diffi culty with the Trinity in the Godhead, but his argumen was dangerous. The Scriptures authorize us to think of threefold distinction in the Deity, and this is to be limite only by the unity of the Godhead. This trinal conceptio of Deity is as much revealed as the divine unity or simplicity Howe objects to Sherlock's hypothesis that it leaves out th nexus, or 'natural eternal union,' by which the three are one. Mutual consciousness is the result, not the cause c the union. It would not constitute three spirits one, fo they might have a mutual insight into each other's thoughts without a substantial unity. There must be such a unio as that of body and soul to make a real unity. This is supposed to be the best representation of the union wit distinction of the Trinity in the Godhead. Howe adds tha God speaks to us as men, and will not blame us for con ceiving of things so infinitely above us according to the capacity of our natures, so long as we do not make ourselve the measure of Him. Between God and us there is a likeness, but with an 'infinite unlikeness.'

To the 'Calm and Sober Enquiry' Howe added some letters which he had written to Dr. Wallis. He suggested the possibility of a wider distinction than that of modes.

Person not the same as substance.

He objected to the use of the word 'person' in Dr. Wallis's sense. Hypostasis in Heb. i. 3, the authority which Dr. Wallis quoted, was not to be identified with the Latin 'persona' in the sense that one might act the parts of different characters or persons. On Dr. Wallis's hypothesis, there seemed to be but one real hypostasis in the Godhead, and if but one, then the incarnation of the Son was impossible without also the incarnation of the Father and the Holy Ghost. To make the persons only modes, Howe said, was nothing more than Unitarianism. By three persons the orthodox have always understood three intelligent hypostases.

Sherlock answers Howe.

Sherlock dealt with Howe in a postscript to his 'Defence' in answer to South. He was scarcely less indignant that a Nonconformist should almost agree with him than that

he virulent South should abuse him for a heretic and an idolater. He was satisfied that Howe had successfully defended him from the charge of Tritheism. But he would shrink from the responsibility of saying what Howe had said concerning the persons of the Trinity. Howe had supposed three spirits, united eternally but never identified, each having its individual essence, so that the three were never one, except by such union as unites a body to a soul. Sherlock held up Howe as a genuine Tritheist. But for himself and his own theory, Tritheism was a charge which could only be made 'by the malice of implacable enemies.'

Firmin's 'Third Collection of Tracts.'

In 1695 Thomas Firmin's friends issued 'A Third Collection of Tracts.' The first was by the chief writer in the two former series, who undertook to refute every Trinitarian of every kind that had appeared in that age. In the list were included Tillotson, Stillingfleet, Burnet, Fowler, and Howe, as well as South and Sherlock. He begins with Stillingfleet's sermon in 'Vindication of the Mysteries of the Christian Faith.' Stillingfleet's first position is that 'God may require justly of us to believe on His word what we cannot comprehend.' This is admitted to be true, but not to the purpose. We converse every day with things that we cannot comprehend. All the works of God have upon them the signature of incomprehensibility. We do not comprehend the least spire of grass. All the chemists in the world, and all the members of the Royal Society, are not able to make a barleycorn or a grain of wheat. These are mysteries which we cannot comprehend. But the articles of the Athanasian Creed, the writer says, are not denied because they are mysteries, or because we do not comprehend them. They are denied because we can comprehend them. We have a clear and distinct perception that they are not mysteries, but 'contradictions, impossibilities, and pure nonsense.' Our reason would be given us in vain, all science and certainty would be destroyed, if we could not distinguish between mysteries and impossibilities. The Bishop's first point is granted, as not touching the Unitarians.

The second is that 'there is no greater difficulty in the conception of a Trinity, or the Incarnation, than there is in the conception of eternity.' This is admitted to be to the

CHAP. IX.

purpose, but denied to be true. In previous tracts it has been shown that in the orthodox Trinity and Incarnation there were many contradictions. Stillingfleet says that 'if God was for ever, He must be from Himself,' which implies that God was before He was. The writer of the tract answers he is sorry that an eternal God must be a contradiction. Stillingfleet adopted the Platonic definition of eternity, as expressed by Boethius, that it is 'a perfect and complete possession of eternal life all at once.' The incompatibility of this with the idea of duration Stillingfleet called a difficulty not to be explained, and the Unitarian called it a contradiction. Stillingfleet's third proposition is that 'the way or manner of saving sinners by the Lord Jesus Christ, which is taught by the Church, is more for the benefit and advantage of mankind than the other way is.' This the writer of the tract says is not to the purpose. The question is not which way is the more advantageous, but which is true. It is, however, denied to be more advantageous. The conditions required from us are the same on both schemes. On the side of God the only difference is that the Trinitarian says Christ satisfied the justice of God on our behalf, and the Unitarian that Christ 'prevailed on the mercy of God for us.' Stillingfleet is charged with misrepresenting the Unitarian doctrine of the atonement. Unitarians never, the writer says, 'denied that Jesus Christ made Himself a voluntary sacrifice for the expiation of the sins of mankind. They ever acknowledged that the Lord Christ was an *expiatory* sacrifice for our sins, as may be seen in the Racovian Catechism, in the Epistles of Schlichtingius and of the excellent Ruarus, as also in our late prints in the English tongue. What we deny is this, that this sacrifice was by way of true and proper satisfaction, or full and adequate payment to the justice of God. We say this sacrifice, as all other sacrifice, was only an oblation or application *to the mercy of God*. A sacrifice it was, which it pleased God to accept for us, though He might have refused it. And for this reason it is said all along in Holy Scripture that God *forgives to us our sins*, and not that He received a satisfaction or an equivalent for them.'

Unitarians did not deny the expiatory sacrifice of Christ.

Bishop Burnet's sermon was on the divinity and death of

hrist. It is the second of the four sermons addressed to he clergy of his diocese. The Bishop does not approve of ny of the explanations of the Trinity that had been made ither by Dr. Wallis, Dr. Sherlock, or John Howe. He peaks of the ancients—that is, the old philosophers and hurch Fathers—as inclining to views nearly identical with nose of Sherlock, but the schoolmen to the views of Wallis r South; and he intimates that the latter were the 'dregs ither of the Æones, of the Valentinian heretics, or of Pla- onic notions.' This being the case, the Unitarian answers hat Trinitarians should 'not lay so great a stress as they lo on the doctrine of the Trinity.' Burnet prefers to speak of the Trinity as simply 'the Blessed Three.' He would iot object to the word 'persons,' provided he could be sure hat it would be understood as he intended it. The principle s accepted that there are things which we must confess to xist, and yet there may be such difficulties as amount to a demonstration against them. We believe in bodies and in motion, 'yet their nature is encumbered with insuperable difficulties.' The Unitarian answers that we have not such evidence for the existence of the Trinity as for that of bodies and motion. We have neither the testimony of sense nor reason. We have not the authority of one genuine text of Scripture. Sandius is referred to for quotations from many learned Trinitarians who say that without the authority of the Church the Trinity cannot be proved from Scripture. The Bishop argued for the supreme divinity of Jesus Christ from the worship which was commanded to be paid to Him, and which was paid to Him, in the New Testament. The tract-writer admits the worship, but denies the validity of the inference. In 1 Chron. xxix. 20, we read that all the congregation worshipped the Lord and the King. To God they gave the worship that was due to Him as God, and to the King that reverence which was due to him as King. We must bow to the Saviour. The very angels of God must worship Him. But, the Unitarian says, He is to be worshipped not as God, but as the Intercessor, the Head over all things to His Church, the Teacher and Lawgiver. Burnet, like Stillingfleet, had misunderstood the Unitarian view of the atonement. He supposed it to be a denial of Christ's

Bishop Burnet on the Trinity.

Unitarians worship Christ.

CHAP. IX.

'expiatory or propitiatory sacrifice.' The writer of this trac shows that it is really identical with that adopted by Burne in this sermon. 'In giving his opinion concerning the satisfaction by the Lord Christ, he doth not say, with others of his party, that it was a *strict or plenary satisfaction*, bu only that God *accepted* it. This is to say, the satisfaction o Christ was not rendered to the *justice* of God as an equiva lent amends or satisfaction, but to His mercy as a supplica tion, and as such *accepted*, and this the Socinians not only grant but contend for.'

Tillotson on the Trinity.

After proving that Dr. Sherlock is as much a Socinian a Dr. Wallis, and that Bishop Fowler and John Howe ar simple Tritheists, the writer comes at last to Archbisho Tillotson. The sermons criticized were Four Sermons or the Death of Christ, preached in St. Lawrence Jewry i 1679 and 1680. They were not published till 1693. The reason of their being published is prefixed in an 'advertise ment.' It was 'the importunate clamours and malicious calumnies' of those who said that the Archbishop was no sound on the doctrine of the Trinity. When the Archbisho published his sermons, he gave one of the first copies t Thomas Firmin. And when the tract we are now exa mining was published, Firmin went to Lambeth and pre sented a copy to the Archbishop, who told him that he ha a great respect for many Socinians because of their learning, their sincerity, and their exemplary lives, but that he alto gether disapproved of their doctrines. Afterwards, when he had read the 'Explications,' he said to Firmin, 'My Lord of Sarum shall humble your writers.'

The Word made flesh.

Tillotson's Four Sermons were on the text, 'The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us.' Taking these words with the context, he urged them as a clear declaration of Christ's divinity. The interpretation usually put on them by Socinians was as applicable, he said, to the first chapter of Genesis, or any other chapter, as to the first verses of St. John. Wit and fancy may allegorize anything, and put a meaning into a passage different from its real one, but the true meaning of this text is too obvious to be overlooked. The Unitarian writer never fails so thoroughly as in his effort to answer this argument. He says that the opening

erses of the fourth Gospel prove only Arianism at most. He disputes what Tillotson said of the object of the writer of the Gospel, and he ends with casting doubts on its genuineness. It was not received, he says, by the ancient Unitarians, who usually ascribed it to the heretic Cerinthus.

Dr. Williams defends Tillotson.

The 'Considerations on the Explications' were answered by John Williams, afterwards Bishop of Chichester. He defended the genuineness of St. John's Gospel and the Archbishop's interpretation of the first verses. The old Unitarians, he said, had tried to prove that this Gospel was not genuine, because it overthrew their opinions. When this failed, they invented interpretations which changed St. John's meaning.

Bishop Burnet on satisfaction.

To this vindication by Dr. Williams was added a letter from Bishop Burnet, defending his sermon. The chief point of interest in this letter is Burnet's explanation of his view of the atonement. He expresses surprise that any one should say that the Socinians from the beginning regarded the sacrifice of Christ as expiatory. Socinus, he says, did not, and the Racovian Catechism is express against it. Grotius asserted it, without insisting on the metaphysical notions connected with it. But Crellius answered him, advocating the first notions of Socinus. Burnet charges the author of the 'Considerations' with omitting some of his words which affected the sense. His doctrine was that Christ died not only for our good, but *in our stead*. Substantially, however, Burnet's sense was given. He says that he avoided the niceties introduced by Anselm and the schoolmen about the antecedent necessity of a satisfaction or an equivalent. They are not in the Scriptures and are no part of the doctrine of the Church of England. He referred to the 'learned performance' of Dr. Outram as expressing the views generally received by the clergy. Our Articles, he adds, determine nothing on the subject, but rest in the general notion of expiation and of reconciling us to God.

'The Agreement of the Unitarians with the Catholic Church.'

The only one of the Firmin tracts which requires further notice is called 'The Agreement of the Unitarians with the Catholic Church.' It contained a reply to Edwards against Locke on the 'Reasonableness of Christianity,' to Bishop

CHAP. IX.

Williams, Bishop Burnet, and some other advocates of th doctrine of the Trinity. The greater part of this tract printed at the end of the Life of Thomas Firmin, under th title of 'An Account of Mr. Firmin's Religion.' The principle underlying it is that there is really no difference, except in words, between Unitarian and Trinitarian. Edwards charged the Socinians with admitting that there wer errors in the Bible, which is indignantly denied. A serie of propositions laid down by Edwards, containing popula charges against the Unitarians, are examined in order, an answered in a way that would surprise many persons wh are unacquainted with the beginnings of Unitarianism. Th charges are crude enough, but the answers alone are of any interest to us. The writer says that the Unitarians do not deny three persons in the Godhead. What they deny is that these three are eternal minds, spirits, or infinite subsistences. The doctrine of the Nominals—that is, of Dr. South and Dr. Wallis—'is and ever was the belief of the Unitarians as wel as of the Catholic Church.' Christ is God in respect of hypostatical union with the Deity. The divinity was and i always in Christ. 'More than this is the heresy of Eutyches and less we never held.' The Trinity of the schools and o Augustine is accepted in the form of 'unbegotten wisdom o mind, reflex or begotten wisdom, called in Scripture the Logos, and the eternal spiration of divine love.' Propitiation by Christ's death, original sin in the sense of inherent guilt, and revelation as distinguished from natural religion, are distinctly advocated with as much fulness and clearness as by many theologians whose orthodoxy was never suspected. There were some doctrines peculiar to Socinus and the foreign Socinians, that were never received by the English Unitarians. The answer to Burnet on the question of satisfaction has some interest. It is re-asserted that the Racovian Catechism does teach that Christ's death was an expiation or propitiation for sins.* It is maintained that Dr. Outram's doctrine is in substance the same as has always been taught by Socinians, and the writer is glad to learn

No real difference between Unitarians and Trinitarians.

* This is correct. The Catechism says that 'Christ, by the divine will and purpose, suffered for our sins and underwent a bloody death as an expiatory sacrifice.' (P. 297, translation by Thomas Rees, 1818.)

at it is generally received by the clergy of the Church of ngland.

Sherlock's doctrine condemned by the University of Oxford.

While the bishops were defending the Trinity against the Considerations' of Thomas Firmin's friends, Dr. South had alled to his aid the heads of the University of Oxford gainst the heresies of Dr. Sherlock. By a decree dated November 25th, 1695, Dr. Sherlock's doctrine of three nfinite minds was 'judged, declared, and decreed false, mpious, and heretical, contrary to the doctrine of the Catholic Church and the publicly received doctrine of the Church of England.' On the previous Sunday Dr. South preached before the University. His spirit being stirred within him because of the prevailing idolatry, he called upon the authorities to come forward to the condemnation of 'Deism, Socinianism, and Tritheism, lest they should fall from ecclesiastical grace and the door of preferment should be shut against them.' Dr. Sherlock found the decree written in Latin which defied the rules of syntax. He called it 'a mere sham,' and wondered that anybody could imagine that 'the heads of colleges and halls' were the University of Oxford.

Sherlock preaches against reason before the Lord Mayor and Aldermen.

The decree was refuted, and so was the refutation of the decree. The whole world was against Sherlock, from the Catholic Church to the Oxford doctors, from the schoolmen to Dr. South. He was universally condemned as a setter-forth of three gods. But the irrepressible Dean was valiant against all his enemies. On Sunday, April 25th, 1697, in the Guildhall chapel, before the 'Lord Mayor and Court of Aldermen,' he convicted his adversaries of 'corrupting the faith by philosophy.' To denounce reason before a 'Court of Aldermen' may have been fitting as to time and place, but it was scarcely becoming in a divine who had given the most metaphysical explication of the Trinity ever announced to the world. 'Beware,' said Dr. Sherlock, abusing the words of St. Paul, 'lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit.' He adopted the specious argument that we are to distinguish between philosophy and the faith of Christ, as if this could be done without the exercise of reason, which is the foundation of all philosophy. The Bible Sherlock defined as revelation. The oldest parts are the

CHAP. IX.

Declares that what Scripture says is to be received, though contrary to reason.

books of Moses. If they contain anything contrary reason and philosophy, then that which is contrary to reaso and philosophy is to be received. This principle is applie to all the doctrines of Christianity, yet with the provisio that we must understand what the Scriptures really teac concerning these doctrines. Revelation—that is, the Bibl —reveals the supernatural, as sense and reason reveal th natural. Revelation does not tell us how anything exist but only makes known that it does exist. This sermon di not escape criticism. Its 'dangerous heterodoxies' were se forth in a treatise on 'The Doctrine of the Catholic Churc and of the Church of England concerning the Blesse Trinity.' Whatever is against reason, the writer said, i folly and falsehood. If the articles of faith are agains reason and philosophy, so much the worse for them. Sher lock is reminded of a passage from his 'Vindication of th Trinity,' where he says he would not believe Scripture if i contradicted the plain dictates of reason. He is told tha the doctrine of the Catholic Trinity is not a mystery, that is not incomprehensible, and that all the mysteriousness an incomprehensibility belong only to his own heresy, whic has been condemned by the universal consent of council and universities, philosophy and reason.

Dr. Thomas Burnet, Master of the Charterhouse, was con nected with Sherlock and South in a popular satire.* H

* *Tune, 'A Soldier and a Sailor.'*

A Dean and Prebendary
Had once a new vagary,
And were at doubtful strife, sir,
Who led the better life, sir,
  And was the better man,
  And was the better man.

The Dean he said that truly,
Since Bluff was so unruly,
He'd prove it to his face, sir,
That he had the most grace, sir,
  And so the fight began, etc.

When Preb replied like thunder,
And roared out 'twas no wonder,
Since gods the Dean had three, sir,
And more by two than he, sir,
  For he had got but one, etc.

Now while these two were raging,
And in dispute engaging,
The Master of the Charter
Said both had caught a Tartar,
  For gods, sir, there were none, etc.

That all the books of Moses
Were nothing but supposes;
That he deserved rebuke, sir,
Who wrote the Pentateuch, sir;
  'Twas nothing but a sham, etc.

That as for Father Adam,
With Mrs. Eve, his madam,
And what the serpent spoke, sir,
'Twas nothing but a joke, sir,
  And well-invented flam, etc.

Thus in the battle royal,
As none would take denial,
The dame for which they strove, sir,
Could neither of them love, sir,
  Since all had given offence, etc.

She therefore, slily waiting,
Left all these fools a-prating,
And being in a fright, sir,
Religion took her flight, sir,
  And ne'er was heard of since,
  And ne'er was heard of since.

CHAP. IX.

ook no part in the Trinitarian controversy, but his 'Archæo- giæ Philosophicæ' was published in 1692, soon after South's Animadversions.' In this work Burnet treated the Mosaic counts of Adam and Paradise as Eastern fables or myths, hich, though not literally true, represent some moral truths. o the multitude of people at that time this seemed a far reater heresy than denying the Trinity or dispensing with he ancient Creeds.

Dr. Thomas Burnet's 'Archæologiæ Philosophicæ.'

Several years before the publication of the 'Archæologiæ 'hilosophicæ,' Dr. Burnet had published his celebrated ork on 'The Theory of the Earth.' This work was mainly ounded on Scripture, but under the guidance of the avowed rinciple that the authority of Scripture was not to be em- loyed in questions concerning the natural world in oppo- ition to reason. This did not mean that the Scriptures ad not authority, but only that our interpretation of them night be wrong, and it might be dangerous to that autho- ity to oppose it to evident natural facts. Augustine had learly laid down this rule, and yet he violated it in main- aining from Scripture the impossibility of Antipodes. Bur- net says that no truth concerning the natural world can be an enemy to religion, for truth cannot be an enemy to truth, and God cannot be divided against Himself. Religion is not to be afraid of new theories in science, and when their truth is established it must be acknowledged. The present theory is to support the Scriptural doctrines of 'the uni- versal deluge' and 'a paradisiacal state.' The sacred histories are to be confirmed by the light of nature and philosophy.

His 'Theory of the Earth.'

The paradisiacal state of the earth is supposed to have existed until the Flood. There were then no mountains nor oceans. The great abyss was in the heart of the earth. The surface was nearly level and covered with blooming fields and placid winding rivers. There was no distinction of seasons but a perpetual equinox. The few changes in the atmosphere were the cause of the longevity of the first inhabitants of the world. It was truly the golden age, which was no mere fable of the poets, but the actual state of the world before the Flood, the world as God made it when He pronounced it good.

No seas nor hills before the Flood.

If the earth had been in the same state as it is now, a

CHAP. IX.

universal deluge would have been impossible. All th water in all the oceans put together would have beer insufficient to cover the tops of the mountains, and if wate sufficient had been found it could not have been removed ir the four or five months mentioned in Genesis. The accoun of the water given by Moses, is that the abyss of the grea deep was broken up. The earth was rent and the water under the earth burst forth and overflowed the world. Ir this cataclysm, according to Burnet, the mountains wer formed. The abysses were the valleys, and the parts o earth that did not break were the mountains. This is illustrated by an arch of a bridge falling into a river. The pillars of the arch remain far above the waters, but sloping downwards to the bottom of the river are stones rolled upon each other in the same kind of confusion as we now see ir the bosom of the earth, which everywhere bears marks of a ruin. The crags and cliffs, the seashore and the mountain-sides, all speak of a disruption. The order of nature has been broken. The very rocks are recumbent or prostrate, showing some kind of dislocation from their natural position.

How the mountains were formed.

St. Peter on the world before the Flood.

This theory of the paradisiacal earth is thought to be sanctioned by St. Peter, who speaks of the world before the Flood as 'the earth standing out of the water and in the water;' or, as Burnet translates the words, 'consisting of water and by water.' It was in the condition of being easily destroyed by a deluge. It is now in the condition of being easily destroyed by fire. This last purification will be its restoration. Then shall come the new 'heavens and the new earth,' that is the present earth restored to its primal condition. Paradise shall be restored. The renewed earth shall have an eternal spring. The mountains shall flee away and 'there shall be no more sea.'

Dr. Burnet's heresies refuted by Bishop Croft.

Dr. Burnet did not escape the suspicion of heresy, even for this very orthodox theory of the earth. The old Bishop of Hereford, Herbert Croft, who in other days had himself been outlawed for a heretic, wondered where were all the learned men of the universities, and what 'the governors of the Church were doing that they suffered such perversions of Scripture to pass unnoticed.' The Bishop believed that

Burnet had been in the moon, and under the influence of that wandering planet had ceased to be quite sane. He wrote 'Animadversions on the Theory of the Earth,' in which he found Burnet wresting the Scripture to support his theories. Burnet supposed that the inhabitants of America who had got there before the Flood, were preserved as Noah was, only in some other ark. But Bishop Croft held to the words of Scripture, that by the family of Noah the whole earth was overspread. In the 'Archæologiæ Philosophiæ' Burnet takes greater licence with the literal meaning of the Scriptures. He doubts if the serpent ever had the power of speech. He does not regard the six days' work as creation out of nothing, but only as formation. He is not disposed to regard even the six days as literal, and he lays down broadly the principle that Moses, after the Eastern custom, spoke of physical subjects in veiled or figurative language. He 'passed by, for the most part, physical truth,' and followed 'moral, or rather theological, reasons in his narration of the world's original.' Burnet also wrote a book concerning the state of the dead, in which he maintained the sleep of the soul, and the resurrection, not of the body, but of a spiritual body which was properly a new creation. Sleep, however, he explained not as unconsciousness, but as an imperfect state of existence between death and the rehabilitation of the soul with a glorified body.

The Mosaic creation a myth.

Burnet's interpretations of Genesis were of some service to Charles Blount, one of the first who accepted the name of Deist. He connected them with the theological system of Lord Herbert, showing the certainty of natural religion in contrast with the uncertainty of what was called revelation. The small volume of tracts that was published by Charles Gildon after Blount's death was one of the earliest avowals of open Deism, and yet it was a Deism which meant little more than doubts about the literal truth of Bible histories. The volume was preceded by a memoir of Blount, and a vindication of his committing suicide because he was unable to marry the sister of his deceased wife. The act itself, with Gildon's sentimental defence of it, approach very closely to things which are generally labelled as silly. In the 'Vindi-

Charles Blount and Deism.

CHAP. IX.

cation of Dr. Burnet,' Blount does not go beyond Burnet i his view of the Scriptures. He does not dispute the truth of what they record, but he disputes the sense of many things as they are usually understood. He gives them as Burnet sometimes did, a new sense. He says that Moses makes Adam the father of the Jews only, but other Bible writers make him, by hyperbole, the father of all men It is supposed to be improbable that the very day men were made they should fall into sin. The benevolent Father of all, the writer says, would not surely have placed His creatures in such a dangerous state, that as soon as His hand had finished His work they fell headlong to destruction, ending in everlasting torment. Moses is supposed to have followed the example of the lawgivers of antiquity, who usually began with a cosmogony. Blount calls himself a Deist, but by Deism he means natural religion, without implying any necessary negation of Christianity. He argues as Lord Herbert had done, from natural reason, for the existence of God, the immortality of the soul, and the certainty of rewards and punishments in the life to come Natural religion is said to be universal; but revealed, from its nature, must be only partial. The Scripture histories are not taken in their literal sense, yet their divinity is declared to be evident when compared with the scriptures of other religions. Blount published a translation of Philostratus' 'Life of Apollonius,' which was supposed to be intended to set forth the miracles of Apollonius as counterparts to those of Jesus. But this is a mere inference. There is no trace of any such design. On the contrary, Blount advocated the probability of miracles, supposing them necessary for establishing the truth of religion.

His 'Life of Apollonius.'

Nathaniel Taylor on 'The Oracles of Reason.'

The 'Oracles of Reason' were answered by Nathaniel Taylor, minister at Pinners' Hall. In a facetious 'Epistle to the Reader,' he says that the Deists who set up for reason have 'no greater stock' of it than their neighbours. 'The poison,' he adds, 'has been recommended to the world by the alluring name of the *Oracles of Reason*, and there can be no doubt, unless it be because of the weakness and folly of them, *by whom*, they who have vented them, were inspired. But the devil cannot always speak through

e serpent. Sometimes he must use a *duller animal.*' enomous creatures weave cobwebs, that are, however, rong enough to hold some 'little insects.' Taylor is to ow the 'great advantage of revelation above reason.' e takes for illustration two points, the pardon of sin and future state of happiness. Preparatory to the argument recommends piety, humility, and knowledge. A pious an has the witness in himself. He cannot doubt of aven when he finds that his soul is fitted for it. Like the an in the Gospel he says, 'Why, herein is a marvellous ing, that ye know not from whence He is, and yet He th opened mine eyes.' As a good constitution throws poison so the soul of a truly pious man is able to overme doubts and difficulties. The new creature has a 'surnatural instinct.' It is this, and not 'dry reason,' which akes Christians steadfast in the faith.

Humility is recommended, that we may not stumble at ysteries, which should not be a prejudice against faith, but argument for it. We find mysteries in natural religion, d should, therefore, expect them in revealed. The practical rt of Christianity, like the brighter colours of a picture, clear. The articles to be believed are the 'dark shades,' d 'must of necessity be obscure.' The foundation of so eat a building is laid 'underground, and out of sight.' y knowledge we are able to give reasons for faith. Chrisnity is a religion worthy of God. We cannot but approve it as soon as it is proposed. It is suited to our wants. explains the great mystery of evil, which no human wisdom could ever explain. The rapid progress of the spel demonstrates its truth. God could never have blessed and furthered a lie. After these arguments follow those from the dispersion of the Jews, the frustration of Julian's efforts to rebuild the temple by balls of fire from heaven, the fulfilment of the prophecies of Daniel and Isaiah, the 'Acts of Pilate,' and the awful death of Maxis, who forged new 'Acts of Pilate,' full of blasphemy against Christ. The main argument is, that revelation gives a certainty concerning the pardon of sin which reason uld never have done. Repentance, Taylor says, is not ough. There must be satisfaction, and we could only

Revelation necessary because of the doctrine of satisfaction.

CHAP. IX.

know of the satisfaction through the Scriptures. Th argument is directed, finally, not merely against Bloun but against Lord Herbert, Benjamin Whichcot, John Lock and all who supposed that God could forgive sin witho satisfaction to justice. To suppose this is to make rev lation unnecessary. It is therefore Deism.

Charles Leslie's 'Short and Easy Method with the Deists.'

Charles Leslie's 'Short and Easy Method with tl Deists' was another answer to the 'Oracles of Reaso and Blount's 'Life of Apollonius.' It was in the for of a letter to one whose 'unhappy circumstances' placed him in company where all 'revealed religion was turne into ridicule.'* Leslie had been requested to give, if po sible, one clear ground of reason which would demonstra the truth of Christianity without the necessity of 'running to authorities and the intricate mazes of learning.' T method he laid down was first to establish the matters .. fact which are recorded of Jesus in the Gospels. The- being connected with miracles prove the truth of what J taught. If, for instance, Moses really led the Israelites (of Egypt in the miraculous manner recorded in Exodus, must have been sent from God. Several things are me- tioned which, coming together, place any event record in history beyond the possibility of doubt. These are shown to meet in the matters of fact recorded of Moses and Jesus, while they are wanting to those recorded of Mahon and of heathen deities. They cannot in fact all be present in any imposture whatever. Leslie calls them 'rules' or criteria. They are, that the matters in question be such as can be judged of by man's external senses; that not only public monuments exist in memory of them, but that some outward actions be performed, and that the monuments, actions, or observances date from the time of the events commemorated. If Moses had not brought six thousand men out of Egypt, after a sojourn of forty years, it is impossible that he could have persuaded the people to believe what he records in the Pentateuch. He addressed his history to those who had been witnesses of the events of

* The *British Critic* says that this person was the first Duke of Leeds. Leslie's editor says, on Leslie's authority, that the letter was addressed to a 'gentlewoman,' though beginning with 'sir.'

CHAP. IX.

The impossibility of the books of Moses being forgeries.

hich he speaks. Leslie argues that it is impossible any ıe in a later age could have imposed on the Jewish nation ɔoks of laws, persuading them that they had been acknowdged by the nation since the time of Moses. The books ɔntain the histories of national observances which were ɔld in commemoration of the events recorded. If they were ırgeries of a later age it must have been necessary to perıade the people, contrary to what they knew, that they had ractised these observances from the time of Moses. Or if ıey practised them before the books were forged, then the eople must have been persuaded to ascribe to them an rigin different from the true one. Leslie illustrates the npossibility of this by supposing that he were to write a ook which explained the origin of Stonehenge as stones et up in memory of the labours of Hercules, pretending ıat his book was written in the time of Hercules. At ilgal stones were set up in memory of the passage hrough the Red Sea. The people were to teach their hildren that they were the memorial of a great miracle rought in the days of their forefathers. To have perıaded the people in a later age, by a forged history, that his was not the origin of these stones would, according to eslie, have been as difficult as the accomplishment of the bject by the supposed book concerning Stonehenge. The ase of Moses being established, that of Jesus stands by the ame argument. The works of Jesus were done publicly. They are commemorated by ordinances or memorials. Since the time of their institution they have been celeɔrated without interruption. As Moses instituted an order ɔf priests to continue in an unbroken succession, so Jesus ɔrdained apostles and other ministers to preach His gospel, administer His sacraments, and govern His Church always to the end of the world.

Arguments for the truth of Christianity.

This is Leslie's short and easy method, but he adds some ɔther considerations which tend to establish the truth of Christianity. Some of these are the fulfilment of prophecy, he testimony of hostile writers, as Josephus and Tacitus, o the fact of Christ's historical existence, and the improbability that ten or twelve illiterate men should convert the world, without the help of arms, oratory, or any external

CHAP. IX.

advantage. Leslie challenges the Deists to bring forwa Apollonius, or any other impostor, and try him by the rul which have been laid down for testing the facts of the liv of Moses or Jesus. We did not see the works of Jesus wit our own eyes, but we have 'a demonstration from histor witnessed to by memorials, and certified and attested by a uninterrupted succession of clergy appointed to continue the end of the world.'*

Charles Gildon converted by Leslie's 'Short and Easy Method.'

The 'Short and Easy Method' had a signal victory. was the means of converting Charles Gildon, the editor the 'Oracles of Reason,' to whom Leslie wrote a further e position of the doctrines of Christianity. He obviated th objection against satisfaction for sin, by showing that Go was not merely just, but justice itself, and that this justic by its very nature must exact to the uttermost farthing God's infinite justice could not co-exist with His infinit mercy, but for the economy of redemption. This absolu satisfaction is shown, however, not to be satisfying unle our good works are added. It was the error of the Di senters to make good works of no effect to salvation, an Christ's death to avail only for the elect. The 'gentlemar was also exhorted to take care not to confound the Chur with any sect. A sect was defined as a company of peop believing certain tenets, like a sect of heathen philosopher The Church, on the other hand, was a society under gove nors appointed by Christ, with power to admit or exclud members, and authority to govern the affairs of the bod The governors were the bishops, the successors of the apostles. There is scarcely an error, Leslie says, that ha come into the Church, which has not come by 'infraction episcopal authority.' He concludes with 'an infallible demonstration of Episcopacy,' in which he shows that Episcopacy is infallibly established by the same short and esay method which establishes Christianity.†

* The suicide of Blount, which was defended by some of the Deists, Leslie regarded as a judgment to which they were delivered, 'a visible mark set upon them to show how far God has forsaken them.'

† The 'Short and Easy Method' was published in 1696. There was no answer to it till 1710. In reply to this Leslie wrote 'The Truth of Christianity Demonstrated' in a dialogue between a Christian and a Deist.

Writes 'The Deist's Manual.'

Gildon wrote as a retractation 'The Deist's Manual.' It 'as dedicated to Archbishop Tenison. In the true spirit of hat time, he ascribed his conversion solely to reason. He :arted with the conviction that if Christianity be true the ıeans of arriving at its truth must be very simple. The ıethod, therefore, of defending it by arguments which could ıot be understood without great learning could not be the ight one. It was in fact this which led Gildon to Deism. Ie now tried to divest himself of all prejudice, and by pure nd simple reasoning was convinced of the truth of revela- ion. The Manual is written in the tedious form of a dia-)gue between a Deist and a Christian. Both are willing to)llow reason. The Deist will not go a step beyond it, and he Christian agrees to this, only with the addition that eason be unbiassed by prejudice or passion. When the)eist comes to a mystery, or something beyond his compre- ıension, he stops. The Christian, on the other hand, finds ; point where reason itself dictates submission. This)osition is illustrated by a quotation from Augustine, who ays that 'it is but just that reason submit when it judges hat it ought to do so;' and by another from Pascal, who ays that 'if reason never submitted there would be nothing ıupernatural or mysterious in religion.' Even in the nysteries reason is never forsaken. It fixes and justifies ur belief in things which we do not comprehend. A great art of the book is taken up with the refutation of what is ıpposed to be the doctrine of Hobbes.

Leslie refutes the Unitarians.

After Leslie had confounded the Deists, he returned to he Unitarians, adding the congenial work of convicting Tillotson and Burnet of the Socinian heresy which they pro- essed to refute. Thomas Firmin, though a decided Church- nan, had often wished that the Unitarians could hold sepa- ate meetings, where they could preach their doctrines more reely than the laws of the Church permitted. This was ccomplished soon after Firmin's death, not, however, by the Jnitarians, who where Churchmen, but by some ministers vho had been expelled by the Presbyterians for embracing Jnitarian doctrines. It was bad enough for Leslie that ome members of the Church of England had fallen into the Jnitarian heresy, but even that heresy became darker when

CHAP. IX.

combined with the Presbyterian schism. He published a curious document, which the London Unitarians were said to have addressed to the ambassador of the Emperor of Morocco,* in whom they recognized a brother Unitarian. The ambassador was congratulated as a champion for the truth of the divine unity, which Mahomet, the great prophet of his people, had defended against the idolatry of the Trinitarian Christians. Leslie proved that the English Unitarians were improperly called Christians at all, that 'they were more Mahometans than Christians, and greater enemies to Christianity than the Mahometans.'† A Christian is defined as one who worships Christ as God. It is not enough, he says, to make a Christian that a man believes in Christ as the Messiah, or Word of God. The Koran teaches all this but Mahometans are not thereby Christians. English Unitarians do not worship Christ, and for this they are disowned and denied to be Christians by all other Socinians or Unitarians in Christendom. Leslie's own explanation of the Trinity is that adopted by South, that there are three persons in one nature, just as in one humanity there are many men. We do not say three gods, because this might lead us into the danger of Polytheism; but we say three persons because they all partake of the divine nature. The three are one in the same sense as every spirit has understanding, memory, and will, and yet is but one spirit.‡ Notwithstanding this rational explanation of the Trinity, Leslie uses many ingenious arguments to obviate the objection, supposing it admitted, that the Trinity is a contradiction. The most excellent of these is a demonstration that if the Trinity is a contradiction it must be divine. Nobody, he says, would invent a contradiction; whatever is invented is always plausible.§ Leslie's knowledge of the Fathers was sufficient to assure him that they really believed some Pagans, as Plato and Pythagoras, had penetrated into the mystery of the Trinity.

Denies that they are Christians.

The Socinianism of Tillotson, that 'unhappy man,' was mainly confined to his denying satisfaction for sin in the

* Ameth Ben Ameth, Ambassador of the mighty Emperor of Fez and Morocco, to Charles II., King of Great Britain.

† Works, vol. ii. p. 34.

‡ Vol. ii. p. 72.

§ Vol. ii. p. 73.

CHAP. IX.

Proves Tillotson to be a Socinian,

ense of a literal and necessary price. He had published he sermons against Socinianism, preached at St. Lawrence Jewry, expressly to refute the slander of the Nonjurors that he was a Socinian. But Leslie saw in the publication only a scheme 'to clear his reputation, now that he is got into an higher station,' and who knows if the sermons were not changed since they were preached? He had never been at the trouble to clear himself before, though he had 'long lain under the imputation of having been neither christened, nor a Christian in his principles.' But even now he avoids the 'Shibboleth.' He says not a word of the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father. He quotes part of the very sentence in the Nicene Creed where it is mentioned, and yet he omits it. To Leslie this was a strong confirmation that he did not believe the Son to be of the same substance with the Father. On the doctrine of 'satisfaction,' Tillotson continues 'a rank Socinian,' not even trying to clear himself. He even said that God might, for anything we know, have forgiven men without the death of Christ. He was supposed to have intimated that it was really possible for the Divine Being not to make hell eternal, on the ground that God might forgive without His justice being avenged. Leslie calls Tillotson's whole conception of the Christian religion 'barbarous, absurd, and blasphemous,' saying that if his name had not been prefixed to the sermons he would have pronounced them the work of Lodowick Muggleton. Tillotson left it doubtful whether sacrifice had originally been instituted by God or invented by man. He inclined to the latter opinion, supposing that God had given it His sanction in condescension to human weakness, and in due time caused it to be superseded by a more rational worship. Leslie calls this a blasphemous scheme of divinity which makes God the devil's ape.* He proved that Tillotson had derived his theology from Hobbes, that he was the head of the Atheists and the Deists, and that his sermons were in the pockets of every sceptic and libertine, to be read in every coffee-house, that men might no longer be disturbed with fears of the eternity of hell. Burnet, 'called the Bishop of Salisbury,' was a proper suffragan for such a primate. With

A blasphemer, an Atheist, and a Deist.

* Vol. ii. p. 569.

CHAP. IX.

Blount and the Deists, they were carrying on the work o Hobbes, preaching up natural duties, and setting asid revealed religion.

All the theological writers of this age unite in lamenta tions over the progress of Deism. Some allowance is, in deed, to be made for the natural failing of religious peopl to call all who differ from them Deists and infidels. Ther seems, however, to have been prevalent a great indifferenc to religion. Open or avowed unbelief of Christianity i scarcely to be found in any author, yet a tone of scepticisr appears to have pervaded society, and to have found its ex pression chiefly among the clever but not profound dis putants in clubs and coffee-houses. Different partie: assigned different reasons for the origin and progress o unbelief. Some ascribed it to the toleration under William and others to the want of toleration under Charles an James. The Nonconformists charged it on the Church o England, and the Conformists on the Dissenters. The author of a popular tract on the 'Growth of Deism' de scribed the Deists whom he knew as 'persons of loose an sensual lives.' They read Hobbes and Spinoza, and learne to laugh at Balaam's ass and Samson's locks, then to ridi cule all revelation. There were, however, graver causes than the reading of Hobbes and Spinoza. In the time o Charles I. young gentlemen went abroad, and saw the im postures of the Church of Rome. They came back to Eng land, and found a deadly feud between Laud and the Pres byterians. Doubts and probably prejudices arose, which were confirmed when they found themselves compelled by law to conform to the Established Church. For a man to hold a civil office under the Stuarts, it was necessary to be of the bishops' church, however loyal he may have been to the king. Under William there were great changes, yet the bishops managed to fill the livings, if not with Jacobites, yet with men recommended by Jacobites. The conduct of the clergy in taking the oaths after long inculcating passive obedience is also said to have been the cause of great preju dices against religion. Dr. Sherlock, a Jacobite, but not a Nonjuror, held the deanery of St. Paul's, while honest Samuel Johnson, who had fought the battle for William against James, was 'starving on charity.'

'Growth of Deism.'

'The Five Groans of the Church.'

'Ichabod, or the Five Groans of the Church,' which had been originally published in 1663, was republished in 1690. This tract was written by a zealous Churchman. The burden of it was the misgovernment of the Church and the selfishness of the clergy, which, to the great injury of religion, had continued during all these years. The five groans were the negligence of the bishops as to the persons whom they ordained, the profaneness of the clergy, the prevalence of simony, pluralities, and non-residence. The tract had for a frontispiece an afflicted woman with a church in her hands, uttering the significant lamentation, 'all seek their own.' During the years that had passed since the Restoration, she had been in sorrow for the miscarriages of her sons. Her patience had only made them 'more obstinate and untractable.' Though excellent in worship, in doctrine, and in adherence to the word of God, she had yet to lift up her voice, and exclaim, 'Hear, oh ye that pass by, was ever sorrow like to my sorrow?' The charges against the general character of the clergy are very serious. The bishops are said to have ordained men that were very young, some without learning, and some of evil character. The non-resident clergy make the defence that they had curates in their parishes, and the Church asks, what new generation of men is this? The command is 'Go preach the Gospel,' and not 'send your curates.'*

'The Growth of Error.'

The selfishness and inconsistency of the clergy, or the quarrels of religious parties, may have been the cause of the popular indifference to religion, but these had nothing to do directly with the progress either of Unitarianism or of Deism. The origin and cause of systems that are purely speculative are generally to be found in the region of speculation. The author of a tract on 'The Growth of Error,' written from the standpoint of Calvinism, traced the origin of Atheism and Deism to the rejection of the dogmas of Calvin. Arminianism was the first departure from Calvin.

* Many tracts of this age ascribe the contempt into which religion had fallen to the condition of the clergy. In one called 'Mrs. Abigail; or an Account of a Female Skirmish bebetween the Wife of a Country Squire and the Wife of a Doctor of Divinity,' it is said that all the clergy are from the lower orders, that they only marry chambermaids, and yet they set themselves up as equal to the Squire and his wife.

CHAP. IX. To it succeeded Socinianism. Then followed Deism and Atheism. The steps in this gradation, as set forth by this author, do not necessarily follow each other. But the first step is, in a speculative sense, the greatest of all. Calvinism proper took the Scriptures in their literal sense, without using reason to inquire what they really meant. Arminianism said at once that Scripture is nothing but as we understand it. Arminianism rejected the 'inscrutable decrees' as unbecoming God, and therefore unreasonable to man. Socinianism rejected the Trinity as a contradiction to reason. Both objected simply to the 'mysterious,' not that they refused to subject reason to the authority of Scripture, but from a conviction that whatever is really taught in Scripture must be according to reason. To the writer of this tract it appeared that Socinianism denied the nature of God to be unsearchable, and Arminianism denied that His ways are past finding out. The first departure of Arminianism from Calvinism is, apparently, very small. It affects to maintain the doctrines of grace, but when its real character is manifest, it is seen to deny them. Socinianism, in the same way, professed in its first beginnings to believe in a Trinity, in the worship of Christ, and in satisfaction for sin; but when Socinianism was developed according to its essential principles, all these things were denied at first in reality, and at last openly and explicitly.

John Toland's 'Christianity not Mysterious.'

In 1695 the main interest of all these controversies passed into another channel. Locke's treatise on 'The Reasonableness of Christianity' was followed by 'Christianity not Mysterious.' This was published anonymously, but it was soon known to be the work of John Toland, a young Irishman of a capacious intellect, but with an unusual share of the vanity and indiscretion of his countrymen. Toland's proper Christian name was Janus Junius. His parents, if he ever had any, were possessed of so feeble a sense of their duty that they suffered his godfathers and godmothers in mockery to give him this name. When the schoolmaster called the school-roll in the morning, the other boys laughed at the odd cognomen, and to preserve the gravity of his scholars, the master changed it into John. In his lifetime Toland had more sermons preached

against him than any other man since the days of Simon Magus or Alexander the coppersmith. He was educated in the Roman Catholic religion, which he renounced at the age of sixteen, never failing, during the rest of his life, to speak of it as one of the vilest superstitions. He began his studies at the University of Glasgow, and as a sturdy Presbyterian, joined the inhabitants against the soldiers in the persecutions under the second James, for which the magistrates rewarded him with a testimonial, certifying that 'he had behaved himself like ane trew Protestant and loyal subject.' He took his master's degree at the University of Edinburgh, and with the assistance of some Dissenters in England, who looked upon him as the future champion of their cause, he proceeded to Leyden, and studied under the learned Spanheim. His career of universities—for so we must speak—was completed at Oxford, where he profited chiefly by the time spent in the Bodleian library.

Its object to defend Christianity.

The avowed object of Toland's book was to defend Christianity. He prayed that God would give him grace to enable him to vindicate revealed religion. And the greatest vindication which he supposed it to require was that it be freed from the charges of contradiction and obscurity. He laid it down as an axiom that the true religion must be reasonable and intelligible. He promised another book, in which he was to show that in Christianity these conditions are found. In a third treatise he was to prove that Christianity was a religion divinely revealed from heaven, and not owing its origin to mere human intelligence. The last two books were never written. The second, however, is virtually anticipated in 'Christianity not Mysterious.'

Toland applies Bacon's method to the Scriptures.

The peculiarity of Toland's mind was his want of faith in external evidence. He did not believe all that people told him, especially if what was said did not bear its own credibility on the face of it. He regarded history as a story-teller, and tradition as of less value than an old woman's fable. Divines, he said, inverted the order of nature. They discoursed first of the authority of the Scriptures, and after that they proceeded to consider their contents; instead of which we should begin with the contents, for only in this

CHAP. IX.

way can we know that the Scriptures are of divine authority. Bacon began with natural phenomena as the foundation of physical science. Locke had done the same for metaphysics. Toland wished to begin with an examination of the Scriptures themselves, which he regarded as standing in the same relation to the theologian as natural phenomena to the physical investigator.

Reason is above Fathers,

But this supposed in man the capacity of knowing truth. It was an appeal to reason as the ultimate arbiter of right and wrong, truth and falsehood. The Christian world, both Catholic and Protestant, had generally refused to admit reason as the sole judge and discerner of truth. The Scriptures, they said, contain doctrines above reason; and where we cannot comprehend we ought to adore. The Church of Rome had carried this principle to its utmost bounds; maintaining that there were doctrines in the Scriptures not only above reason, but contrary to it, which were not on that account to be rejected, but rather the more devoutly to be received. *I believe because it is impossible*, was an axiom of the Catholic doctors. Some escaped the necessity of using their reason, by supposing that what they themselves did not understand the ancient Fathers understood for them. But Toland showed that the Fathers were not agreed about the meaning of the Scriptures; that they had cautioned their readers not to trust to them, but to use their own reason. And, moreover, it was more difficult to know what the Fathers meant than what the Scriptures meant. The Fathers and doctors of old time had no privilege over us, except priority of birth, if that be a privilege. They were men of like passions with ourselves; and if human reason be defective with us, it was no less defective with them.

and Councils.

Others appealed to General Councils, or the Bishop of Rome, as the visible head of the Church, but they succeeded no better than those who bow to the Fathers. Popes and Councils have refuted their own claims to infallibility by teaching and decreeing doctrines which contradict each other, and by the evidence they have given of being subject to the failings of ordinary men. The true Protestant says that we should keep to the Scriptures alone. They contain all that is necessary to salvation. But as the Protestant

s no infallible external authority on whose word he can ke the Scriptures, he must read them for himself to know nat they teach. To this principle Protestantism, Toland ys, has not been faithful. It has often made the Bible speak e language of a sect. Some system of divinity has been ıbstituted in its place, and often, forgetful of its own first rinciple, that the Scriptures come to us with their own ıthority, and not on that of Fathers or councils, Protest- ıtism has been unfaithful in the full and free exercise of ason as the interpreter of Scripture. Some say we should ide by the literal sense, and when that teaches, or seems teach, anything contradictory, we should receive it by ith. Others say we should use reason as the instrument, ıt not as the rule of our belief, so that what we do not ıderstand should be received as a mystery; that is, some- ıing above our reason. Toland, as opposed to all these, ıid the only foundation of all certitude is reason. Every- ıing revealed is, in virtue of that revelation, within the rovince of reason, in the same way as the phenomena of he natural world, 'so that there is nothing in the Gospel ontrary to reason, nor above it, and no Christian doctrine an be properly called a mystery.' There was a boldness in his statement sufficient to startle the generally sensitive eligious world. But it was greatly mitigated by the ad- nission that after all there are mysteries in the Bible; that s, doctrines stretching beyond our faculties in the same ay, but not otherwise than as the natural world has wonders r mysteries which surpass our comprehension. The con- roversy depends on how much is included in the definition f the word mystery. There are mysteries in nature; that s, things which we cannot explain. There are none in evelation, because revelation explains them. Beyond what s explained there are mysteries, doubtless, but we are not, oland says, called upon to believe them. In fact, there is othing for us to believe except that we cannot understand, nd therefore cannot believe.

We have, according to Toland, four means of information: he experience of the senses, the experience of the mind, uman authority, and Divine authority. The first two are he sensation and reflection of Locke's philosophy; the

Toland builds on Locke's philosophy.

CHAP. IX.

latter two are human testimony and Divine revelation. Human testimony is also called moral certitude, as when a friend relates anything credible, or when we are told that there was such a city as Carthage, or such a man as Luther. Divine revelation is the manifestation of truth by truth itself. If a proposition is evident, we have not the power to refuse assent to it; and if we are deceived where our conceptions are clear and distinct, we may be deceived in everything, even as to the existence of God and conscience. If reason is to be trusted at all,—if the common notions which we all have and daily act upon are grounded on truth, then the Gospel, if it really be the word of God, will not contradict them. There can be no contradiction between the written revelation and our sense of right. If there is, one or other must be given up; and as we only know the truth of revelation by its internal evidence, it is evident where the sacrifice must be made.

Revelation must agree with our natural ideas.

Toland says, that as it is by reason we arrive at the certainty of God's existence, so must we discern His revelations by their conformity with our natural notions of Him. They must agree with reason; they must be rational and intelligible. If the evidence be internal it is only by reason that it can be known, and the discovery of it begets faith or persuasion. A man, from various motives, such as fear and superstition, may give his assent to what he does not understand, but he never has any solid satisfaction in his belief. He never really acquiesces in it until he understands it. Scripture appeals to reason. We are commanded to try the spirits, and as wise men to judge concerning what the Apostles delivered to us. St. Paul, indeed, speaks of the vanity of the wisdom of this world, and says that he did not come with excellency of speech or man's wisdom, which Toland, following St. Augustine, interpreted of the sophists and rhetoricians. If the writers of the Bible never seek to confound or mislead, but to convince the mind, it follows that the best way to get to their meaning is honestly to use our intellects, following the same rules of interpretation which we should apply to any other book. Reason being in this way the channel through which we receive revelation, it is impossible that we can receive as Divine what is contrary to reason.

CHAP. IX.

Nothing in the Gospel above reason.

But is there nothing in the Gospel above reason? In this, too, Toland took the negative. A thing may be above reason in two senses. It may be veiled by figurative words, types, or ceremonies, and reason may be unable to penetrate the meaning till the veil is removed; or a thing may be inconceivable—not to be judged of by our ordinary ideas. In both senses it is a *mystery;* that is, above reason. The word mystery, Toland says, was generally understood in the first sense by the Pagans. To the uninitiated, religion had mysteries, but to the purified or regenerate the veil was removed. In this sense, too, the word is always understood in the New Testament. The Christian doctrines were mysteries till they were unveiled by special revelation.* Some Christians maintain that the doctrines of revelation are still mysterious in the second sense of the word; that is, inconceivable, however clearly revealed. Against these Christians, Toland says that it is not necessary that a thing be a mystery because we have not an adequate idea of it, or a distinct view of all its perfections at once, for then everything would be a mystery. To comprehend anything is to know its chief properties. What is not knowable is nothing to us, for we can have no idea of it. We may not have an adequate or complete idea of every Christian doctrine, but it is not on that account a mystery, any more than the ordinary works of nature are mysteries. What is revealed in religion is known to us, just as we know wood or stone, air or water. Eternity, for instance, is not above reason because it cannot be imagined, any more than a circle is not above reason because it can be imagined. Infinity is as little mysterious as finity, or that two and three make five. It is only trifling with words to call anything a mystery because we do not know its essence. We do not know the real essence of anything in the world; we only know the nominal essence. The soul is no more a mystery than the body, nor the Divine Being than a spire of grass or the meanest flower of the field.

* Mr. Pattison, in the 'Essays and Reviews,' says, "The word *μυστήριον*, as Archbishop Whately points out, always means in the New Testament not that which is incomprehensible, but that which was once a secret, though now it is revealed it is no longer so. Whately, who elsewhere speaks so contemptuously of the cast-off clothes of the Deists, is here but adopting the argument of Toland in his 'Christianity not Mysterious.'"

CHAP. IX.

No mystery in Christianity.

Having thus explained mystery, Toland undertakes prove from the Scriptures that there are no mysteries i Christianity. The Christian doctrines were mysteries befor they were revealed, but now they are unveiled. The mos enlightened philosophers could not discover them, but Go hath revealed them to us by His Spirit. 'We speak,' say St. Paul, 'the wisdom of God hid in a mystery.' It wa hidden from the Gentiles, but it is revealed to us. The lav had a shadow of good things to come, but in New Testamen times they are fully revealed. Moses put a veil on his face but that veil is done away in Christ. The mystery wa kept secret since the world began, but now it is mad manifest. The ministers of Christ are called stewards of the mysteries of God; that is, revealers of what before was secret. The mystery was made known to St. Paul, which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men a it is now revealed unto us. It had been hid for ages anc generations, but now is made manifest to the saints. 'Be hold, I show you a mystery,' said St. Paul to the Corinthians He was to reveal to them a secret; he was to tell them tha those who were alive at the sounding of the last trumpet would put off their mortality to be clothed with immortality as well as those who were then to rise from the dead. The union of man and wife, as a type of the indissoluble union of Christ and His Church, is called a mystery, but now that we are told of it the figure is intelligible. Jesus said, 'To you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them that are without it is not given.' These things were parables to them.

The Fathers on Toland's side.

The judgment of the Fathers is not of much value in Toland's eyes; yet, as M. de Fontenelle says, 'What these honest men could not make good themselves by sufficient reasons is now proved by their sole authority,' and so Toland thinks it worth the trouble to show that they were on his side in this interpretation of mystery. Clemens Alexandrinus tells us that the Christian discipline was called illumination, because it brought hidden things to light, the Master alone removing the cover of the ark. Justin Martyr says that the name Joshua was a mystery representing the name of Jesus, and the holding up of Moses' hands a type or mystery of

hrist's cross, whereby He overcame death, as the Israelites id their enemies. He also calls the predictions of the rophets mysteries, symbols, or parables. Tertullian says hat all mysteries are under an oath of secrecy, and Origen akes the encampments of the Israelites symbols or mys-eries setting forth the Christian's heavenly progress. He as so far from calling Christian doctrines mysteries that e expressly affirms them all to agree with our common otions. The mysteries supposed to exist in Christianity oland divided into two kinds. First, the incomprehensible ogmas which he said were introduced into the Christian eligion by the metaphysicians, and which he likened to the ecult qualities of the ancient philosophers. The second nd were the mysteries introduced into Christianity from agan worship. The only ceremonies originally in the hristian religion were Baptism and the Lord's Supper. hey were both of the simplest character, but by the second third century they were strangely disguised and trans-ormed by the addition of rites borrowed from the heathen. hey were then called tremendous and unutterable mys-eries. The Pagan worship indeed was largely adopted by ie Christian Church when the Roman world was converted o Christianity. The emperors gave the heathen temples or the use of the Christians. The clergy had the benefices f the priests, flamens and augurs; yea, they wore their ery vestments as surplices, stoles, mitres, albs, copes, and asubles. They took the same titles as the Pagan priest-ood, and discoursed mysteriously of initiations, lustrations, nd baptismal regenerations. The Lord's Supper was similarly transformed till it no longer served the object f its institution. 'By endeavouring,' says Toland, 'to make the plainest things in the world *mysterious*, their very nature and use were absolutely perverted and destroyed, and are not yet fully restored by the purest reformation in Christendom.'

Mysteries introduced into Christianity from the Pagans.

'Christianity not Mysterious' had not been long published before it was presented by the grand jury of Middlesex. But in his own country Toland had the greatest honours. He paid a visit to Dublin, and the first Sunday after his arrival he heard an Irish bishop preaching against

'Christianity not Mysterious,' presented by the grand jury of Middlesex.

CHAP. IX.

'Christianity not Mysterious.' He found the clergy in L land so much against him that a discourse concerning his errors was 'as much expected as if it had been prescribed in the rubric.' An Irish peer gave it as a reason why he had ceased to attend church that once he heard something there about his Saviour Jesus Christ, but now all the discourse was about one John Toland. The grand jury was solicited to present his book, and the presentation of the Middlesex jury was reprinted and cried about the streets of Dublin. It was duly presented in the Court of King's Bench. The jurors quoted sundry passages from it. Some of them said they had never read it, and those who did said they could not understand it. His enemies called him a Jesuit, a Socinian, a Nonconformist; adding that they had never read his book, and by the grace of God they never would read it. At length it was brought before Parliament. Toland wished to be present to defend himself, but this w not granted. The House agreed that the book was he tical, and condemned it to be burned by the common hangman, commanding that its author be taken into custody for further prosecution. One member proposed that Tola himself should be burnt; another that he should be made burn his book with his own hands; a third added that it should be done at the door of the House, that he might have the pleasure of treading the ashes of it under his feet. The last wish was complied with, and 'Christianity not Mys rious' was burned before the gate of the House of Parl ment, in the august presence of the sheriffs and constables of the city of Dublin. Toland escaped from Ireland, and did not give his countrymen the opportunity of taking him into custody. At a later date his book was condemned as heretical and impious by the Lower House of Convocation, who blamed the Upper House for failing in their duty by not confirming the sentence. This time Toland was in good company. The inquisitors of Convocation began with 'Christianity not Mysterious,' and ended with a condemnation of Bishop Burnet's 'Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles.'

Burned by order of the Irish Parliament.

The replies to Toland's book were of various degrees merit. Some of them, in the judgment of the writers, we

Refuted by Oliver Hill.

ıanswerable. Oliver Hill wrote 'A Rod for the Back of ɔols.' He said that he had silenced Keith, the renegade uaker, and Harvey with his new fanglement about the rculation of the blood. He had settled the matter with resham College in the case of their pressure and gravita-ɔn of air. And as he had served them, so would he serve oland.

By Thomas Beconsall.

Thomas Beconsall, a clergyman, wrote 'The Christian elief,' in which he maintained that many of the Christian ɔctrines were still mysterious, quoting numerous passages om the Fathers to show that they took this view of the ysteries. No. III. of 'The Occasional Papers' was devoted ıtirely to reflections on 'Christianity not Mysterious.' The riter said that Toland's object was chiefly to oppose the rinity, maintaining that to this doctrine we cannot apply :ason. It is properly a mystery.

By John Gailhard.

'The Socinian Heresy Refuted,' by John Gailhard, had ppended to it some animadversions on 'Christianity not lysterious.' The author identified Toland with the Soci-ians, and spoke of the presumption of those who expected ɔ understand mysteries. He concluded with a prayer that lod would give him understanding according to His word, nd not *according to reason.*

By Thomas Beverley.

Thomas Beverley, a Presbyterian minister, wrote 'Chris-ianity the Great Mystery.' He wished to prove that Chris-ianity is above created reason in its best condition, and ontrary to human reason fallen and corrupt, and so in a roper sense a mystery. Man's reason is like the ass's colt, illy and wild. It naturally refuses divine truth. The word f God is a two-edged sword, which cuts reason in pieces. he reason of God is absolute; to it nothing is mystery. His declaration is, therefore, infallible, and to us mysterious. But God gives the renewed soul an inward experimental ense, by which it can set its seal to truth. The renewed man has a *spirituality* as much above *rationality* as ratio-nality is above sense. Beverley admitted that Revelation had changed the mysteriousness of the Gospel, yet he thought there was mystery in it still. He was anxious to retain the word, lest some of the doctrines which he believed "o be in the Scriptures should be denied under the pretence

CHAP. IX.

of denying mysteries. How far Toland would have agreed with Beverley concerning the inward sense given to the regenerate we cannot well determine. Beverley had stated his doctrine in the usual language of orthodox theology, but he added a sentence which brought him near to Toland. 'There is not,' he says, 'an idea rightly formed, nor one true ratiocination, not one witty invention for good use, not one righteous law or wise decree, but it is by grace through the Mediator, and from Him as the Saviour thus far of all men.'

By John Norris.

'An Account of Reason and Faith in Relation to the Mysteries of Christianity' was the work of John Norris, Rector of Bemerton. Norris was a Churchman, who used to call himself 'a priest of the Church of England,' and as such was devoted to the mysteries. Their cause was with him the cause of Christianity. Toland's book he declared to be 'one of the most bold, daring, and irreverent pieces of defiance to the mysteries of the Christian religion that even that licentious age had produced. But,' he added, 'we learn from prophecy that in the last days many would renounce their faith and turn infidels.' Things above reason Norris defined not such as reason cannot discover, but such as when proposed it cannot comprehend. God has revealed the Christian mysteries, and therefore our assent is not grounded on any internal evidence from their being rational or intelligible, but on the fact that God has given His word and authority for them. Whatever God reveals is true. Here is something revealed by God; therefore it is true. Our whole business is simply to ask, Does this come from God? Internal evidence for or against a matter of faith Norris reckoned worth nothing. Hobbes and Bishop Pearson had agreed that, after all, faith in the Bible was only faith in man; but Norris thought he could prove that, independent of internal evidence, it was faith in God. He quoted, in the way of endorsing, a French Catholic writer, who drew an argument for the divinity of the mysteries from their being universally received, notwithstanding that they were s repugnant to reason.

While Toland was in Ireland, the cause of the mysteric was taken up with some ardour by Peter Browne, a senic

By Peter Browne, afterwards Bishop of Cork.

fellow of Trinity, afterwards Bishop of Cork. It was in the character of an opponent to Toland that Browne pushed himself into notice, which gave Toland occasion to say that he had made Browne a bishop. His reply was in the form of a 'Letter' in answer to 'Christianity not Mysterious,' and 'to all those who set up for reason and evidence in opposition to revelation and mysteries.' .Browne promised to show the weakness and folly of Toland's 'arguings, and to lay open his cheats and fallacies.' He reduced his leading errors to these two: that evidence is the only ground of persuasion, and that now, under the Gospel, the veil is perfectly removed. It is admitted that in Christianity there is nothing contrary to reason, and, in a sense, nothing above reason. And had Toland said this for any good, that is, for any orthodox object, Browne would not have been disposed to dispute with him, but he professed to see that Toland's 'main drift was to set up natural religion in opposition to revealed.' He said also that Toland, by talking about the reasonableness of religion, could only mean that the Christian world denied it. Evidence, Browne maintained, is not the only ground of persuasion, for God requires our assent to many things not intelligible in themselves, such as the equality of the Son with the Father, His eternal generation, the tripersonality of the Godhead, and the nature of the life to come. Under the Gospel the veil is not perfectly removed. Some Christian doctrines are still mysterious. There is something in them which we do not understand, and something of which we are wholly ignorant. The mystery of the future life which St. Paul showed to the Corinthians could never have been known without divine revelation, and now that it is revealed we know it but in part. It doth not yet appear what we shall be. Now we see through a glass darkly. The Divine Being is more mysterious than a spire of grass or a flower, for of these we have an image in the mind, but we have no similitude of God. We have no idea of a spirit, of infinity, or of omnipresence, much less can we understand the divine foreknowledge, for how can it enter into our heads how God can know what has *no* being? Yet all these things we must believe on another authority than that of reason.

CHAP. IX.

By Edward Synge, Archbishop of Tuam.

Edward Synge, Archbishop of Tuam, added an appendix to his essay on 'A Gentleman's Religion,' in which he made some reference to Toland. Synge wrote and reasoned with great calmness and clearness. The few remarks he made showed that he understood the whole question better than many who wrote larger books. He denied that external revelation or testimony is only a *means of information*, for if a proposition be made to us which is reconcilable with reason, and the truth of it attested by persons whose veracity is beyond exception, it cannot but be believed. So that testimony is also a *motive* to persuasion. This did not prove much against Toland, for reason is still left in its office to judge. He undertook to demonstrate this proposition: 'No man may have most sufficient and cogent arguments to give his assent to such propositions as are not only in part but wholly and altogether above his reason.' He proved it by the blind man believing in light and colours. This was bringing the question to the proper issue, which is, the value of the external testimony. Synge said that the contention about mysteries was only a contention about a word. Toland had said that the essence of God was no more a mystery than the essence of any material object; that if we choose to call all things beyond our reason mysteries, the world was full of them; 'and surely,' added Synge, 'if the world is full of them, may not religion be full of them too?' This was well said, only Toland objected to the word mystery being used in this sense at all.

Toland the cause of the controversy between Locke and Stillingfleet.

Toland delighted in the fire which he had kindled. His ambition was gratified when 'Christianity not Mysterious' became the occasion of an intellectual warfare between John Locke and Edward Stillingfleet, Bishop of Worcester. This controversy did not do much credit to either of the combatants. It is certainly a dull, weary, and tedious wrangle. Locke the controversialist is no longer Locke the philosopher, and Stillingfleet loses his reputation for good reasoning. The whole matter between them might have been settled in a page and a half for each side, instead of which, Locke's portion alone fills a volume. In his 'Vindication of the Trinity' Stillingfleet maintained that the Unitarians served the Deists in their method of overthrowing revealed

eligion. He quoted Toland as saying that we must have lear and distinct ideas of a thing before we can have any ertainty of it. Under this cover the Unitarians reject the 'rinity. By the same argument, he said, we are left in ncertainty about the existence of substance, as Toland mits our ideas to those of sensation and reflection. Locke s introduced with Toland and the Unitarians as 'the gentlemen of the new way of reasoning,' who discarded substance ut of the reasonable part of the world. It was an uncertain upposition of we know not what. Locke's illustration was hat of the earth supported by the tortoise, and the tortoise upported by the elephant. Stillingfleet said we had a eneral idea of substance as the support of accidents. And e concluded from Locke's arguments that to be certain of he existence of a spiritual substance it was not necessary hat we have a clear and distinct idea of it, nor that we be ble to comprehend the mode of its operations. From this e drew the inference that we are not justified in rejecting a loctrine proposed to us as of divine revelation because of ur inability to comprehend the manner of it, and especially when it relates to the divine essence. Certainty, he argued, does not always come from clear and distinct ideas. We have a clear and distinct idea of God, but that does not prove His existence.

Locke repudiates Toland's principles.

Locke was indignant at being introduced with Toland and the Unitarians as 'the gentlemen of the new way of reasoning.' He denied that he had anywhere placed certainty only in clear and distinct ideas, and he called upon Stillingfleet to show him the place where he had said that a doctrine proposed as of divine revelation was to be rejected because we did not comprehend the manner of it. What Locke did say was simply that 'certainty of knowledge is to perceive the agreement or disagreement of ideas as expressed in any proposition.' He renounced all connection with Toland's doctrine as quoted by Stillingfleet. He showed that Stillingfleet's own head was not clear on the subject, that he had maintained the very thing which he undertook to oppose—the necessity of clear and distinct ideas—for he had said that it was necessary to understand *person* and *nature* before we could discourse of the Trinity.

CHAP. IX.

Locke was able to fall back on some passages in his 'Ess on the Human Understanding,' in which he had made a wide distinction between 'certainty of knowledge' and 'assurance of faith.' The first was connected with clear and distinct ideas, but the second depended on divine revelation. He took the authority of the Scriptures as the voice of God, in the same sense as the orthodox world took them. Stillingfleet made a mistake in not distinguishing between Locke and Toland, and Locke resented it even more than measure for measure. But for Stillingfleet's mistake there was some excuse. Toland professed to bow to the authority of the Bible as well as Locke, only he maintained that there was nothing in the Bible which we are required to believe that did not agree with our reason. And Locke sometimes really said almost, if not altogether, the same thing.

Toland's 'Letters to Serena.'

Some years later, under the title of 'Letters to Serena' Toland published a volume of essays on various subjects Serena was supposed to be Sophia, Princess of Hanover One of them is on the 'History of the Soul's Immortalit among the Heathen.' The doctrine itself has been revealed in Christianity, so that we have there the best and clearest demonstration of it. God Himself has revealed it. It may not in everything fall under our comprehension, yet it is true and absolutely certain. Toland goes on to say that, though the believer be equally ignorant with others about the nature of a thing, yet he may have the greatest conviction of its existence. This seems to contradict the main doctrine of 'Christianity not Mysterious.' It certainly contradicts it as his opponents understood it. Another of these essays was on the 'Origin of Idolatry.' Toland draws attention to an important distinction between the sound notions and moral practices of the ancients, which he ascribes to the light of reason, and the corrupt practices of the heathen world. Overlooking this distinction, some have said that heathenism was a better 'foundation for works than Christianity. They should only have said at the most that the law of nature was sometimes better fulfilled by the heathen than by Christians.' Others think that all who lived in the heathen world were idolaters, an error which ought to be corrected. Arnobius says that if the works of Cicero were read, the

Christians need not trouble themselves with writings. At the end of the 'Letters to Serena' was added 'A Confutation of Spinoza,' and another paper as a defence of the Confutation.' Toland maintained the distinct existences of matter and spirit. Matter, however, he considered to be infinite, and necessarily endowed with motion. Descartes supposed that in the beginning God gave 'a shake to the lazy lump.' Spinoza, like many of the old philosophers, supposed the divine essence to be identical with the essence of the universe; so that, in virtue of the divine presence, all matter was animate. Toland thought there was no need for this supposition when it could be proved that motion was essential to matter. Dr. Samuel Clarke wrote a tract in refutation of this theory, and William Wotton, B.D., wrote a 'Letter to Eusebia,' occasioned by the 'Letters to Serena.' He did not find fault so much with what was said in the 'Letters to Serena' as with what he supposed to be implied, but left unsaid.

Toland generally supposed to be a Deist.

Toland is usually classed with the Deists, but his Deism is only inferred. He never openly ceased to believe in the authority of the Scriptures. It is certain, however, that he never explained the nature of that authority, or satisfactorily adjusted its relations to reason. The same is true of Locke, but Toland, either from circumstances or from the natural bent of his mind, was chiefly occupied in raising questions that were hostile to received opinions. The storm raised by 'Christianity not Mysterious' was scarcely allayed when he engaged the learned world in a controversy concerning the canon of Scripture. He did this without intention. An accidental spark fell upon combustible materials, and a great fire was kindled.

Writes the 'Life of Milton.'

Toland wrote a 'Life of Milton.' As Milton had written 'Iconoclastes' in reference to 'Eikon Basilike,' which was ascribed to Charles I., it fell within Toland's province to give the history of the latter book. It was written by Dr. Gauden, Bishop of Exeter. This was known to Anthony Walker and Brian Duppa, Bishop of Salisbury. It was revealed to the world by Dr. Gauden's widow. It was also attested by Lord Anglesey, who had it on the authority of the second Charles and the Duke of York. For writing it Gauden was promised the bishopric

CHAP. IX.

Ascribes 'Eikon Basilike' to Bishop Gauden.

of Winchester, but 'he was put off with that of Worcester. After a full account of the 'Eikon Basilike,' Toland said, in conclusion:—'When I seriously consider how all this happened among ourselves within the compass of forty years, in a time of great learning and politeness, when both parties so narrowly watched over one another's actions, and what great revolution in civil and religious affairs was partly occasioned by the credit of that book, I cease to wonder any longer how so many suppositititious pieces, under the name of Christ, His Apostles, and other great persons, should be published and approved in those primitive times, when it was of so much importance to have them believed; when the cheats were too many on all sides for them to reproach one another, which yet they often did; when commerce was not so general as now, and the whole earth overshadowed with the darkness of superstition. I doubt rather the spuriousness of several more such books is yet undiscovered through the remoteness of those ages, the death of the persons concerned, and the decay of other monuments which might give us true information, especially when we consider how dangerous it was always for the weaker side to lay open the tricks of their adversaries, and that the prevailing party did strictly order all those books which offended them to be burnt or otherwise suppressed.'

Dr. Blackhall preaches against him before the House of Commons.

On the thirtieth of January, soon after the publication of the 'Life of Milton,' Offspring Blackhall, afterwards Bishop of Exeter, was preaching before the House of Commons in his capacity of Chaplain to the King. After abusing Toland, and vindicating the genuineness of 'Eikon Basilike,' he exclaimed:—'We may cease to wonder that he should have the boldness, without proof and against proof, to deny the authority of this book, who is such an infidel as to doubt, and is shameless and impudent enough even in print, and, in a Christian country, publicly to affront our holy religion by declaring his doubt that several pieces under the name of Christ and His Apostles, *he must mean those now received by the whole Christian Church, for I know of no other,* are suppositititious.'

Toland defends the 'Life of Milton,'

Toland wrote in reply 'Amyntor; or, A Defence of Milton's Life.' Using Blackhall's words, he said the charge

and raises a controversy about the canon of Scripture.

was 'an impudent and a shameless one.' He did not mean the books of the New Testament. He wondered how any one who had been so long at the University had never heard of spurious writings in the name of Christ and His Apostles. He drew up a catalogue of apocryphal books, adding that a great part of these were the spurious writings to which he referred. He intimated, however, that the whole question of the New Testament canon required a fuller and more impartial treatment than it had yet received. A matter of so great importance should not be taken on trust. Its history ought to be investigated. There was not a book of the New Testament which had not been rejected by some of the ancients. The various sects in those days, like the various sects now, condemned each other for damnable heretics. The Epistle to the Hebrews, that of James, the second of Peter, the second and third of John, and the Revelation, were long doubted by that part of the Church which we reckon to have been soundest. Toland added a quotation from Dodwell, who says that 'the canonical writings lay concealed in the coffers of private churches or persons till the latter times of Trajan, or rather, perhaps, of Adrian; so that they could not come to the knowledge of the Church. For if they had been published, they would have been overwhelmed under such a multitude as were then of apocryphal and supposititious books, that a new examination and a new testimony would have been necessary to distinguish them from false ones.'

Samuel Clarke on the defence of the 'Life of Milton.'

Dr. Samuel Clarke, in a letter to a friend, made some remarks on 'Amyntor.' He chiefly objected to Toland that in denying the genuineness of the Epistles of Clemens, Ignatius, Polycarp, and Barnabas, he made too little of the judgment of the Church, both ancient and modern. Eusebius testifies that the Epistle of Clemens to the Corinthians was generally read in the churches as Scripture. These Epistles were not of canonical authority, yet some reverence should be paid to them.

Stephen Nye defends the canon of Scripture.

Stephen Nye wrote a 'Historical Account of the New Testament.' He would not admit the truth of what Dodwell said about the sacred books being so long concealed in private chests. He maintained that the Fathers made a

CHAP. IX.

marked distinction between the canonical books and the Epistles of Clemens, Ignatius, and Barnabas, or any of those mentioned in Toland's catalogue. He admitted that they are often quoted as Scripture. Toland said that the writers of the canon were strangers to each other, and that the clergy were unacquainted with the books of the New Testament till a hundred and thirty years after Christ. Nye would not admit this, for the Fathers of the first century had quoted from them; and as to the writers being strangers, it was evident that Mark had abridged Matthew, that Luke had read other Gospels, and that John approved of Matthew, Mark, and Luke. Toland said that the Ebionites had a Gospel of Matthew, and the Marcionites a Gospel of Luke, different from the Gospels of Matthew and Luke as we have them; that considerable sects of Christians ascribed the apostolic writings to heretics, and that Celsus had complained of the Christians that they had altered the Gospels three or four times. Nye answered that the Ebionites had probably Matthew's Gospel in Hebrew; that Marcion had retracted his vicious copies of Luke; that John's Gospel was rejected only by the Alogians, who afterwards saw their errors; and as to Celsus, it was the copies of Marcion and the Valentinians that were changed, not those that were read in the churches.

The canon vindicated by John Richardson.

Another reply to the 'Amyntor' was 'The Canon of the New Testament Vindicated,' by John Richardson, late Fellow of Emmanuel College, Cambridge. He began by controverting some statements made by Basnage; that for three centuries after Christ there was no certain canon, when both private persons and also whole Churches partly admitted supposititious books for sacred, and partly despised the genuine as profane; that Origen believed Hermas' Pastor to be divinely inspired; that Theodorus of Mopsuestia calls the book of Job a fable borrowed from Paganism, the books of Chronicles and Esdras a vain rhapsody, and the Song of Solomon a love song; that Eusebius says of the Second Epistle of Peter that it was no part of the New Testament, and that in the time of Gregory Nazianzen some of the orthodox received it and others rejected it. Richardson answers that the Second Epistle of Peter and

he Epistle to the Hebrews were both reckoned canonical by the Council of Laodicea; that Theodorus is not to be aken as representing the Catholic Church—in fact, he was condemned by the fifth General Council; and as to Origen, ie speaks of the Pastor of Hermas as divinely inspired, but iot as canonical. Richardson distinguished between Scripture, inspired Scripture, and canonical Scripture. Origen, ie says, reckoned the books of the Apocrypha uncanonical; and yet he calls the books of Wisdom and Maccabees Scripture in the same way as the Homilies of the Church of England call the books of Tobit and Ecclesiasticus by the same name. Divinely-inspired Scripture includes all books which teach truth. Such Origen reckoned the Pastor of Hermas, and among these Clemens Alexandrinus included the writings of the ancient philosophers. The canonical books are those which were written by Apostles, or at least had apostolic authority. These alone were absolutely infallible. Richardson said that Toland had an excellent talent for detecting forgeries. If he could believe that 'Eikon Basilike' was not written by King Charles, it was no wonder that he doubted the genuineness of the Epistles of Barnabas, Polycarp, Ignatius, and Clemens Romanus. He maintained that spurious writings under the names of the Apostles were soon detected. The Church was cautious in receiving books as canonical. In different places the canon was different until all the books were universally known by the Church Catholic. This was about the time of the death of St. John, the beginning of the second century.

A work of much greater pretension than Richardson's, called 'A New and Full Method of Settling the Canonical Authority of the New Testament,' was written by Jeremiah Jones. He admitted that the subject had great difficulties. Casaubon and Spanheim affirmed that the Fathers quoted apocryphal books promiscuously with the canonical as Scripture. Archbishop Wake said that the Apostolic Fathers were inspired, and therefore incapable of mistaking the mind of the Apostles; and that their writings contained the 'true and pure faith of Christ without the least error intermixed with it.' Whiston reckoned their works as authentic books of the New Testament, and also many

By Jeremiah Jones.

CHAP. IX.

books not now extant. Toland thought, and Jones sa justly, that if the writings of the Apostolic Fathers we genuine, they were as much entitled to be in the canon as Gospel of Mark or Luke. Jones bestowed great labour o his work, but he does not seem to have had a clear idea his own mind what he meant by the canon. At one tir he says it is simply a question concerning the genuinene of certain books; at another time he says that those boo only are canonical which the first Christian writers ha cited as Scripture, and all others are not. He admits th there was no certain agreement about the canon till t fourth century, but he denies that in the writings of t first ages of Christianity the canonical and apocryph books are promiscuously cited as Scripture. He quot from Catholic and Protestant writers the grounds on whi they respectively receive the Scriptures. The Catholi receive them simply on the authority of the Church. Without this authority they are of no more value than Æsop fables, and St. Matthew is no more to be credited th Livy. The Reformers received the Scriptures on the internal evidence, or from the Spirit witnessing in the that they were the word of God. Some English divin took an intermediary view, allowing full weight to the i ternal evidence, yet receiving the canon on the authority of the universal Church. Jones, as we have seen, was dispos to rest it on the genuineness of the books. Toland raised great question which we cannot pursue further. It is pe haps correct to say that it is not yet settled.

Toland publishes 'Nazarenus.'

After a visit to Holland, Toland published 'Nazarenus; or, Jewish, Gentile, and Mahometan Christianity.' This book consisted of three parts. One was an account of a gospel which Toland had discovered in Amsterdam. He maintained that it was the Gospel received by the Mahometans, and he thought it identical with the ancient Gospel of St. Barnabas. He followed an opinion, which had been maintained by Peter Martyr and others, that Mahometanism was originally a Christian heresy. Its canonical books were the Pentateuch, the Psalms, a Gospel of Jesus, and the Koran. In the Gospel of Barnabas, Mahomet was named as the promised Paraclete. Mahometan writings have many

assages out of our Gospels, and some out of the apocryphal; ut they have also many passages which are found in neither. 'oland's knowledge of Mahometan writings was derived :om second-hand sources, and on this subject he was vul- erable. But the real object of 'Nazarenus' was to set)rth a peculiar doctrine about the original of Christianity,) vindicate some of the early heretics, and to show that the oods of corruption came in with the dominant sect which rrogated to itself the title of the Catholic Church. The Jospel which he discovered he supposed to be the same as he Gospel of the Ebionites, or Nazarenes. He maintained hat they were the first Christians—a theory which has een ardently supported by M. Renan in his 'Life of Jesus.' t is grounded on some passages in Epiphanius, who says hat the first Christians took to themselves the name of Jazarenes, and by this name they were called till at Antioch hey got the name of Christians. They were also called bionites, from a Hebrew word signifying 'poor,' because he first disciples of Jesus were poor Galileans. When the hristian Church went beyond Judea, they were treated as eretics. Toland argues that the Mosaic economy was)inding on all believing Jews. The Gentiles alone were ree from it. Jews and Gentiles were to be united into one hurch, but it was to be a union without uniformity. This, ie says, reconciles the differences between Paul and Peter hout ceremonies, and Paul and James about justification. 'eter and James write to the Jews, the scattered tribes,)ut Paul writes to the Gentiles. The severance between he two parties was brought about by the Gentiles, when uch 'hot-headed raving monks as St. Jerome' were per- nitted to say that whoever kept the Jewish law 'was plunged nto the gulf of the devil.' The Gentiles were the subverters f Christianity. They clung to their native superstitions, nd would neither fast nor pray at the same time as the ews.

Maintains that the Ebionites were the Nazarenes.

Thomas Mangey, a clergyman in Guildford, afterwards Rector of St. Mildred's, Bread Street, replied to 'Nazarenus' at some length, and controverted all that Toland had said concerning the Mahometan Gospel, the Nazarenes, and the Jewish law. Mangey's friends thought that 'so weak and

Thomas Mangey answers 'Nazarenus.'

CHAP. IX.

wicked a book should be treated with contemptuous silence He himself did not think the book should be unnoticed but as to 'the religion or learning of Mr. Toland, he knew no subject so little worthy of the world's notice or his examination.' Mangey says that Toland blunders on his very title-page. The heretical sect were not Nazarenes, but Nazaræans. They had their name not from Nazareth, but from a word signifying 'separate' or 'holy,' equivalent to Puritan. They professed both the law and the Gospel. He denies that the first followers of Jesus took to themselves the name of Nazarenes. It was given to them by the Jews in contempt, as when Tertullus called Paul a ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes. The Ebionites, or Nazaræans, erred in supposing the Mosaic institutions necessary to salvation. They were not called Ebionites from their poverty, but from their founder, *Ebion*. 'I do not know,' says Mangey, 'any fact of antiquity better proved than that there was such a person, and that he gave the name to the sect.' They mistook the whole spirit of the Gospel, which was an entire abrogation of the Jewish law. God Himself had begun to teach this to the Jews by the later prophets. They were to pay less attention to ceremonies. He had given them statutes 'which were not good.' Our Lord not only rescued the law from the narrow and false interpretations of the Jewish doctors, but He entirely repealed it, telling His disciples that the 'law and the prophets were until John.' The charge against Stephen implied that the Jews expected the Christians were to destroy their law. Mangey had many texts in his favour, but he was perplexed with the command to abstain from blood. He interprets it as meaning effusion of blood, that is, murder; supposing the words 'things strangled,' which follow, was a gloss upon *blood*. The reading, he says, was unknown to the ancients.

Defends the Gentile Christians.

The Gentile Christians are defended, and the corruptions charged on the Judaizers. The early Church is set forth as a pattern of purity. 'In this,' he says, 'I do defend our own most excellent Church.' As to the Mahometans, they have no canonical Scriptures except the Koran. They have apocryphal writings, and one of these is a Gospel sent to Jesus. They knew nothing of a Gospel of Barnabas, no

l the ancients know of such a Gospel any more than the ahometans. Among the many spurious writings forged r the heretics there is no such Gospel named, except in the sputed canon of Pope Gelasius, and this declared that it as not genuine. There is a legend of a copy of St. Mat-ew's Gospel having existed in St. Barnabas' handwriting, hich Mangey supposes to have been the origin of a Gospel ing ascribed to Barnabas. Toland's candle is extinguished, s 'folly,' 'weakness,' and 'ignorance' exhibited, though ncerning this Gospel he erred, if he did err, in company ith Ludovico Vives.

Thomas Brett on 'Nazarenus.'

Dr. Thomas Brett wrote a book called 'Tradition necessary Explain and Interpret the Holy Scripture.' It was pre-ded by a preface which was chiefly devoted to Toland's Nazarenus.' It was confined, however, to some remarks nich Toland had made on the canonical books of Scripture, nd the scarcely perceptible difference which the Fathers ade between them and the apocryphal. Toland's difficulty, id Brett, could only be solved by tradition, which had ways distinguished between the books received into the non and those rejected as supposititious. For proof of is he appealed to the Fathers.

'Anti-Nazarenus.'

'Anti-Nazarenus, by way of answer to Mr. Toland, and so against a late pamphlet entitled The Difficulties and iscouragements which attend the Study of the Scriptures,' as written by James Paterson. The pamphlet was the ork of Francis Hare, Bishop of Chichester. Paterson's gument was that the Scriptures are the word of God; at this is proved both by the excellency of the doctrine nd the power and wisdom of God manifested in them, also r miracles and the fulfilment of prophecy. Finally, the hurch is built upon a rock; that is, a never-failing succes-on of bishops and priests.

Toland's character.

Of the character of Toland we know but little. He seems have been one of those men who have always more nemies than friends. If we except Lucilius Vanini, per-ps no man in history has been more universally abused. 'Israeli says that 'he had all the shiftings of the double-ced Janus, and all the revolutionary politics of the ancient nius.' Toland's politics consisted chiefly in an ardent

CHAP. IX.

attachment to the Prince of Orange. In religion he professed to conform to the Church of England. A Scot schoolmaster, of the name of Huddleston, who wrote an account of his life, says that he remained steadily attached to Presbyterianism till the hour of his death. After praising Toland for his attachment to the Revolution, he adds: 'Real and unaffected piety, and the Church of Scotland, which he thought bore the greatest resemblance to the primitive simplicity of the apostolic times, always found in him an able and inflexible advocate.' All his adversaries united in setting but little value on his talents or acquirements; but this was surely unjust. Leibnitz, who knew Toland personally, says that he is 'glad to believe that the design of this author, a man of no common ability, and, as I think, a well-disposed person, was to withdraw men from speculative theology to the practice of its precepts.' * His learning was extensive, and his abilities far beyond the average lot of even eminent men. As the work of a young man in his twenty-fifth year, 'Christianity not Mysteriou was a marvel of intellectual strength. He had, indeed, high estimate of his own powers, and this apparent vanity repelled some who would have been his friends. With the failing natural to his countrymen, he gave out that he was descended of an ancient and noble family. D'Israeli says: 'When in after-life he was reproached with native obscurity, he ostentatiously produced a testimonial of his birth and family, hatched up in a convent of Irish Franciscans in Germany, where the good fathers subscribed, with their ink tinged with their Rhenish, to his most ancient descent, referring to the Irish history, which they considered as a parish register fit for the suspected son of an Irish priest.' With the Irish tendency to exaggeration, Toland boasted of having enjoyed in Holland the friendship of Limborch and Le Clerc. Limborch doubted if he had ever seen him, and Le Clerc believed that he had once met him. In Ireland he spoke of John Locke as if he were the bosom friend of the philosopher. Nothing could have given greater offence. Locke, who had a high opinion of Toland's abilities, disowned him for ever. The world has but little toleration

His excessive vanity.

* Quoted by Mr. Pattison in 'Essays and Reviews.'

r men who show a consciousness of their own greatness. nd yet what is the difference between them and others, ıt that they have not learned to affect humility like those ho have more worldly wisdom? All great men know that ıey are great. And for those who by the force of their wn talents have risen from humble positions, it is almost ıpossible to conceal the sense of their greatness. When heodore Parker was dying, he said to his friends: 'I have ad great powers committed to me, and I have but half sed them.' When Robert Burns lay on his death-bed, overwhelmed with poverty and wretchedness, among his last ords to his wife were these: 'Ah, Jean! the world will ıink mair o' me a hundred years after this.' They may ıll this vanity who wish to sneer, but it is the overpowering ense of greatness, and a better evidence of a true man than ıe affectation of humility.

Toland published some time before his death a book ılled 'Pantheisticon,' which did not add to his fame. A ıbject so deep and mysterious as the relation of the Divine ;eing to the universe should never have been treated with ıe levity of the 'Pantheisticon.' Toland's failings were vidently great. They cannot be entirely excused, though ıuch may be said in extenuation. He was, says D'Israeli, a seed cast out to take root wherever it could.' The seed vas good, but it fell on stony ground. His whole life was roubled and restless. He had a hard struggle with poverty ·om the beginning to the end of his days. No one knew ow he got the means of subsistence.* He made frequent isits to the Continent, and it was insinuated that he was a monitor of princes and diplomatists.' He wrote a Latin pitaph for himself, in which he mentioned the place of his irth, his knowledge of ten languages, and his love o

His 'Pantheisticon.'

* 'In examining the original papers of Toland which are preserved, I found some of his agreements with booksellers. For his description of Epsom he was to received only four guineas in case 1,000 were sold. He received ten guineas for his pamphlet on naturalizing the Jews, and ten guineas more in case Bernard Lintott sold 2,000. The words of this agreement run thus: "Whenever Mr. Toland calls for ten guineas, after the 1st of February next, I promise to pay them if *I cannot show* that 200 of the copies remain unsold." What a sublime person is an author! The great philosopher who creates systems that are to alter the face of his country must stand at the counter to count out 200 unsold copies!'—D'ISRAELI'S *Calamities of Authors.*

CHAP. IX.

His epitaph for himself.

liberty. It ended thus: 'His soul is reunited to . Heavenly Father, from whom it formerly proceeded; l body, yielding to nature, is also replaced in the bosom mother earth. He himself will undoubtedly arise to eter life, but he *will never again be the same Toland.*'* This h always been taken for Pantheistic heresy. He did not e pect to be, he did not wish to be, the same man that had been. None of us do wish to be what we are he our hope rather is in what *we shall be.* Toland died su denly, at the age of fifty-two, in his lodging at Putney, a was buried in Putney churchyard.† A hundred and fi summer suns have set since then. No tombstone ev marked the place where his ashes repose. He may ha been vain, perhaps he was impolitic, certainly he was unfo tunate; but he was one of the world's great men. Eve man who thinks and feels, whether he be a sceptic or believer, will drop a tear of sympathy by the grave of po John Toland. D'Israeli says that 'he was accused of an i tention to found a sect, as South calls them' of "Mahometa Christians." Many were stigmatized as *Tolandists;* but t disciples of a man who never procured for their prophet bit of dinner or a new wig—for he was frequently wanti both—were not to be feared as enthusiasts.'

Dr. South lived through the reign of Queen Anne, b the active period of his life was ended before the close the seventeenth century. He may be regarded as one of t characteristic specimens of the unyielding churchmen, w

* H.S.E.
Joannes Tolandus,
Qui in Hibernia prope Deriam natus,
In Scotia et Hibernia studuit,
Quod Oxonii quoque fecit adolescens,
Atque Germania plus semel petita,
Virilem circa Londinum transegit ætatem,
Omnium literarum excultor
Ac linguarum plus decem sciens,
Veritatis propugnator,
Libertatis assertor.
Nullius autem sectator aut cliens,
Nec minis, nec malis est inflexus
Quin quam egit vitam perageret
Utili honestum anteferens.
Spiritus cum æthereo patre
A quo prodiit olim conjungitur,
Corpus item naturæ cedens,
In materno gremio reponitur.
Ipse vero æternum est resurrectur
At idem futurus Tolandus nunqua
Natus Nov. 30,
Cætera ex scriptis pete.

† D'Israeli says that, 'Toland die in an obscure lodging at a country carpenter's, in great distress.' His only patron was Lord Molesworth, himself poor. He promised Toland at least *bare necessaries* if he lived. His lordship says: ''Tis an ungrateful age, and we must bear with it the best we may till we can mend it!' The entry of Toland's burial in the register of Putney Church, in 1722, runs thus: 'Mr. John Toland, from Edward Hinton's, buried March 13.'

rere the product of the era of the Restoration. His theology consisted of eclectic incongruities, selected by passion or prejudice, and often in defiance of reason, though, like most f the theologians of his time, he professed to be one of eason's worshippers. Like Sherlock, he preached passive bedience till William was in possession, and then he con- nued to practise it. Though a High Churchman, whose hief object of hatred was the Puritan Dissenter, he yet mbraced the theological system of Calvin. He believed in redestination, reprobation, and a literal satisfaction for sin; nd he honestly maintained that these were truly and pro- erly important parts of the doctrinal teaching of the Church f England. 'This doctrine,' he says, 'passed for good livinity in St. Austin's time, and within less than an hun- red years since in our church too, till Pelagianism and So- inianism, Deism and Tritheism, and a spirit of innovation, he root of all, and worse than all broke in upon us.'* The spirit of innovation' was the spirit which tormented South. He could bear with Puritan doctrine, but he must have no innovation either in the Church or the State; a rubric or a surplice, a collect or an amen, was of more value to South than all the Nonconformists, though they believed the doctrines of the Church, which the multitude of Confor- mists had ceased to believe. The Dissenters were 'vipers' who if admitted to conformity, by the relaxation of any of the ceremonies, 'would eat through their adopted, not natural mother's bowels.' And yet they were in a fatal schism, 'a schism,' he says, 'that, unrepented of and continued in, will as infallibly ruin their souls as theft, whoredom, murder, or any other of the most crying, damning sins whatsoever.' † Yet, to save their souls from 'ruin,' South would not yield the smallest letter in a rubric.

South's Calvinism.

On such questions as conscience and the light of nature, South is often rational. He repeats what had been said by Locke, that those who use their reason honestly, will not be left in darkness. He cannot believe that the heathen who never heard the gospel, must on that account of necessity be lost, yet he finds no evidence that they can be saved in the ordinary way as revealed to us. They

Yet his theology often rational.

* Sermons, vol. iii. Ded. † Sermons, vol. ii. 419.

CHAP. IX.

could know nothing of the satisfaction of Christ, and without faith in that, there is no salvation so far as we know St. Paul quotes a psalm to prove that the whole world had heard the Gospel. Some men have concluded that by this the apostle meant, that all things which declare the wisdom of God, and speak of God to men, do really preach the Gospel. South says of these men that they are 'sottish enough to imagine that the Gospel is preached by the sun and moon,' yet all men are allowed to have a moral sense. The heathen have entrusted to them six grand truths. These are, the existence of God, that He is the maker of all things, that He is to be worshipped with virtue and piety, that the soul is immortal, that we ought to repent of our sins, and that deviation from duty makes men obnoxious to punishment.

His 'moral' preaching.

Neither South's Calvinism nor his High Churchism saved him from the 'moral' preaching which is generally regarded as the reproach of that age. Like Barrow, Tillotson, and the Latitudinarian divines, his favourite theme is the reasonableness of religion. It is pleasant and profitable, the surest way to have peace and prosperity. South's favourite text was the pleasantness of wisdom's ways. He chose this text for one of his famous sermons, which was preached at Court. The argument was the usual one, that in following sin, men lose greater pleasures than those which they pursue. The pleasures of sin are deceitful, but those of religion are real. They are pure, rational, angelical, and 'embased with no attendant sting.' The life of philosophy or wisdom is identified with the life of religion. In opposition to all orthodox theology, especially that which South himself professed to defend, he calls the rational life 'a state of grace.' This is illustrated by the case of Socrates. When the Athenians laughed at Socrates, and called him 'crabbed, lustful, proud, ill-natured,' he said they were right, but that he had conquered all by philosophy. Adam in innocence is called a perfect philosopher. His reason was then unclouded by sin. Those who follow reason and wisdom are so far in the likeness of his innocence, but are far short of his perfection. An 'Aristotle' is but 'the rubbish of an Adam.'

CHAP. IX.

Religion profitable and 'safe.'

The profitableness of religion is evidenced by experience. he divine sanctions given to virtue are manifest to natural ɔason, and enforced by revelation. It is profitable for the fe that now is, and for that which is to come. In the rocess of the argument, South, like most of the moral ivines, virtually despairs of the pleasures of virtue ever eing preferred to those of vice if the present life only is to e taken into account. For this reason he dwells on the dditional motives derived from revelation. These are nbounded bliss hereafter as the reward of well-doing, and ntold punishment for them that do evil. The gains of ighteousness are mostly in reversion, and the disadvantages f a sinful life are far off in the world to come. It is supɔosed that men who do not fear 'the laws, the assizes, or he gallows,' may be deterred from evil by the thought of he 'vengeance of God' and the threatened punishment of ıever-ending pains. To the objection that we really have no ertainty of a life to come either for happiness or misery, South answers, after the fashion of his time, that the life to ɔome was probable. The stake, he said is great, and where there is a probability, we should act upon it and be 'safe.'

Bishop Bull.

The active part of the life of Bishop Bull belongs also to the seventeenth century. He was made Bishop of St. David's by Queen Anne, but he had been ordained by Bishop Skinner in the time of the Commonwealth. Bull was a High Churchman of the ordinary type, without anything peculiar or eccentric. From his youth he was devoted to the Church ınd the king, hating heartily every form of Puritanism or anarchy. His theology was Arminian. He connected Calvin's doctrine with Calvin's discipline, and maintained them ɔoth to be incompatible with the spirit of the Church of England. His first work was on justification. It was written in his youth, and arose out of the great Antinomian controversy which began in the time of the Commonwealth, and ended among the Nonconformists in the time of William.

The controversy on justification is intricate and difficult to follow. The word is borrowed by the New Testament writers from courts of law, without any intimation how far the divine judicature is to be interpreted by the human. The definitions and distinctions of schoolmen and theologians

CHAP. IX.

On justification.

have only added obscurity to what at first was probal simple enough. To understand the different positions Bishop Bull and his opponents on this subject, it is nece sary to know the standpoint or theological system fro which they write. It is only in this way that we can lea the meaning which they attached to the terms they use When a thorough Calvinist takes justification literally, the is no doubt about his meaning. The sins of men in h scheme are a debt, Christ paid the debt for the elect, ar because of this payment God accounts them righteous. The are not just in themselves; it is not necessary that th should be. They are just in another, Christ's justice righteousness is imputed to them. The means of this just fication is faith, which is not a condition performed by tl elect, but something wrought in them. The other schem in its broad outlines, is that they who believe are forgive which is the same as justified or acquitted. Faith is nece sary, but the difficulty begins with the question what fait is, or how much it includes. This question need neve trouble the consistent Calvinist. Whatever is necessar for the salvation of the elect is secured for them. It onl concerns the anti-Calvinist to inquire what faith means. H may make it merely believing some doctrine or history. H may make it trust, and in order to make that trust savin he may include the necessity of repentance and a new lif This in a sense is salvation by works.

The 'Harmonia Apostolica.'

The rigid Calvinists of the time of the Commonwealt were charged with Antinomianism. They were suppose to make void the law through faith. They did not requir any effort from men, because God did the whole work for them. In mere reasoning, the inference was just, but i reality it was unjust. The most rigid Calvinist never be lieved that after men were saved they would continue in sin. An actual righteousness or sanctification was the final link in the chain of election. The supposed tendency of this doc trine was the cause of Bull writing his 'Harmonia Aposto lica,' in which he reconciled St. Paul's justification by faitl with St. James's justification by works. We are said to b justified by faith, because the meritorious cause of justifica tion is the work of Christ, and we are said to be justified by

orks to maintain the necessity of a righteous life. Bull, ke the Calvinists, took the word justification in the sense f righteousness imputed, carrying into the New Testament he refined definitions of modern theology. In this way he as able to ascribe the merit of redemption to the death of hrist, while holding the necessity of good works to justifiation.

Answers to 'Harmonia Apostolica.'

The answers to the 'Harmonia Apostolica' were all by alvinists. Their logical force lay entirely in Bull's taking iterally the analogies of the New Testament. If Christ paid he debt of justice for all, it followed that all were just. To ntroduce, then, the necessity of works, was to add something o the work already complete. Bishop Morley, as a consistnt Calvinist, opposed Bull's doctrine in a pastoral letter to is clergy. Dr. Barlow, afterwards Bishop of Lincoln, read ublic lectures against it at Oxford. Charles Gataker, son f the famous Thomas Gataker, Thomas Truman, a Nonconformist, and John Tombes, the Baptist, were also among Bull's opponents. The most formidable, however, was Dr. Tully, Principal of St. Edmund's Hall, who proved it to be he doctrine of the Fathers, of the Church of England, and f all Reformed Churches, that men are justified by faith lone, without the necessity of works. Bull wrote an elaboate defence of the 'Harmonia' especially in answer to Gataker nd Dr. Tully.*

'Defence of the Nicene Faith.'

Our chief interest in Bishop Bull is from his connection with the Trinitarian controversy. In 1685 he published his Defence of the Nicene Faith.' The immediate cause of his ndertaking this work was to clear himself from the charge f Socinianism. This had been made because of his advocacy f the necessity of good works to justification. It was, of ourse, a mere inference, logical enough as to the one point f satisfaction, but not in any sense admitted by Bull himelf. There were special causes why the work took the form hich it did take. Petavius, Sandius, Episcopius, and Curcellæus had maintained that the Nicene faith was not the aith of the Ante-Nicene Fathers. Petavius, as a Jesuit,

* Richard Baxter, who had been the chief opponent of this form of Calvinism in the time of the Commonwealth, wrote in defence of Bull's views against Dr. Tully. It is supposed that Dr. Tully was assisted in his work by Bishop Morley and Bishop Barlow.

CHAP. IX.

wished to prove the permanent authority of the Church t make new dogmas. The Nicene faith, he said, was not manifested, not distinctly or dogmatically taught, till the Counc of Nice. It was, therefore, useless to look for any Catholi consent as to doctrine among individual Fathers. Sandius as an Arian, had an interest in proving that the Ante-Nicen doctrine of the Church was Arian. Episcopius and Curcellæus wished to minimize the differences on the subject of th Trinity. They were not favourable even to the use of th word Trinity, and wished to return entirely to the use o Scripture language. Bull stood by the Anglican theory, a set forth by the High Churchmen of the time of Charles I. that the Church of the first centuries was to be our pattern and guide. To establish this theory it was necessary to show that the Ante-Nicene Fathers agreed with the Council of Nice, and that this early Church was guided by a kind o infallibility. Bull's argument is expressly grounded on the impossibility of the Council of Nice falling into error on thi subject without a failure of the fulfilment of Christ's promis to be with His Church always. It was natural for Bossue to apply this to the infallibility of Trent as well as of Nice and to exclaim, 'God bless the learned Bull, and reward him for this sincere confession.'

Testimony of the Fathers.

The 'Defence of the Nicene Faith' consists of testimonies from many Fathers to the pre-existence of Christ before He was born into the world, and to His consubstantiality and co-eternity with the Father. It is true, that many of the passages quoted are of doubtful interpretation, and require some ingenuity to restrict them to an orthodox sense. Bull, however, was a rational Trinitarian. In fact, he was compelled to be by the Nicene Creed. He said that Christ was God, but only in the sense of 'God of God.' The Father alone was God of and from Himself. The divinity of the Son and the Holy Ghost was only a derived divinity.

'The Judgment of the Catholic Church.'

Bishop Bull's next work, 'The Judgment of the Catholic Church,' had a more particular reference to the Trinitarian controversy in England. It was a defence of the anathema pronounced by the Council of Nice on all who departed on any point from the Nicene faith. Episcopius had said that the early Catholics did not excommunicate those who did

not believe that Christ was the Son of God before He was born of the Virgin. The manner of the divine affiliation was an open question in the early Church. From this it was inferred that it ought to be an open question with us. The same ground had been maintained by Dr. Bury and many writers of pamphlets, who advocated forbearance and moderation, when Sherlock and South were in the midst of the battle. Bull maintained that forbearance and moderation ought never to be shown when an article of faith was in danger. The Catholic Church had never suffered the landmarks to be removed. The sonship of Christ, as defined by the Council of Nice, had always been, and must always be, necessary to salvation. An array of Fathers are summoned to give evidence. Their testimonies, as in the former case, are made to agree by a little licence in the interpretation. Bull wrote another book of the same kind, called 'The Primitive and Apostolical Tradition of the Doctrine Received in the Catholic Church.' This was chiefly in answer to Daniel Zwicker, a German Unitarian, and his followers in England. Zwicker had traced the orthodox doctrine to the introduction of Platonism and Gnosticism into the Christian Church, and Bull answers by testimonies from the Fathers.*

Bishop Beveridge.

William Beveridge was appointed to the see of St. Asaph in 1704, and died in 1708. The active period of his life belongs also to the latter half of the seventeenth century. He was a Churchman of the rigid type of Bishop Bull, but with a considerable difference, as he embraced the theology of Calvin. He agreed with Bull in making faith a condi-

* Bull's 'Defence of the Nicene Faith' was answered by Gilbert Clerke, in the third collection of Firmin's tracts. The substance of the answer is, that Bull only quotes Fathers known to be orthodox, that is, who received the Nicene theology. The Socinians, Clerke says, might quote Fathers who were opposed to Bull's Fathers, and who were vastly superior to them in number and learning. Such were Theodotian and Symmachus, Theodorus and Paul of Antioch. The Ante-Nicene Fathers whom Bull quotes do not deserve the epithets of 'very learned' and 'very holy,' which he so frequently bestows on them. He 'vends all his geese for swans.' They have not been so described by any other author. The first quoted is St. Barnabas, but it is doubtful if he was the St. Barnabas of the New Testament, if so, his epistle should have been in the Canon. But it was not worthy of this honour, as many Fathers testify. There is no proof that 'The Shepherd of Hermas' was the work of the Hermas mentioned by St. Paul. The writings ascribed to Ignatius, Polycarp, and the Roman Clemens are all uncertain. Theodoret and Augustine testify that the Nazarenes honoured Christ only as a man, and Bull admits that the Nazarenes were the Jewish Christians.

CHAP. IX.

tion in order to our 'being actually vested in that salvati which Christ has purchased for us.' This might, perhaps on other occasions, have been explained away; in fact, must have been, on any consistent theory of predestinatio Beveridge also maintained the universality of the aton ment, saying that Christ had died for all, and that G willed all men to be saved. Salvation was thus made one point to depend on men themselves, and, as few are earnest on this subject, he believed that out of the mult tudes of mankind only a small number would be saved.

The theology of Calvin has the universal consent of Fathers.

Beveridge, like Bull, had embraced the Anglican theo of the infallibility of the Early Church. But he found th universal consent of the Fathers to be on the side of th theology of Calvin. It was not difficult to find the sam theology in the Articles and Homilies of the Church England. In his 'Exposition of the XXXIX Articles Beveridge proves every doctrine by Scripture, reason, an the Fathers. But on Art. XVII. he says, that here we mus put reason aside, and be guided solely by Scripture an Fathers. The elect, on Beveridge's scheme, must hav been an exceedingly choice remnant. Indians, Mahometans Jews, and indeed all who were not Christians, were exclude by authority of Art. XVIII. Heretics, schismatics, an sectaries were excluded by authority of Augustine an Fulgentius. They alone were in the way of salvation wh were members of the Catholic Church, who had been rightly baptized, and to whom the other sacrament had been duly administered. But all these were not to be saved. Out o them was to come the election of grace, to whom 'the godly consideration of their predestination' was 'full o sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort.' Bishop Beveridge was a very pious man, very learned and very reverent. When he was a Prebendary of Canterbury Cathedral he refused to read the brief of King Charles for a collection in aid of the exiled Huguenots. He told Dr. Tillotson, the Dean, that it was contrary to the rubrics. Tillotson answered, 'Doctor! Doctor! charity is above rubrics.' *

* 'A Short View of Dr. Beveridge's Writings' was written anonymously by Dr. Whitby. The estimate of Beveridge is a very humble one. His Calvinism and High Churchism are dealt with severely.

CHAP. IX.

John Norris.

John Norris, Rector of Bemerton, who appeared among ıe adversaries of Toland, was a voluminous writer, but his orks are now forgotten. He had written against Locke ı innate ideas, advocating the doctrine of Malebranche ıat we see all things in God. Norris belonged to the ıore visionary class of modern Platonists, best represented y Henry More. They followed Plotinus more than Plato, ıd in some things they were the immediate disciples of escartes. Norris seems to have taken his philosophy ıd his theology without change from Malebranche. His ırgest work is 'An Essay towards the Theory of the Ideal Intelligible World.' This was founded on the old latonic doctrine of the reality of ideas which, according to orris, was adopted by St. John in the beginning of his ospel. The Logos was the Wisdom of the Father. All ıings were made by Him. In Him was the life, and the fe was the light of men. St. Augustine's rendering of St. ohn is even more in agreement with Plato's theory of leas. 'Instead of 'in Him was life,' Augustine reads that which was made is life in Him.' The ideas were fe in the Logos, Reason, or Wisdom of God. They are ıe things that were made in Him.

His theology from Malebranche.

The world in its ideal is necessarily permanent and mmutable. It is the prototype of the natural world which wes to it all it has of truth or reality, beauty or perfection. It is this of which Job speaks as 'possessed by the ord in the beginning of His way, before His works of old, hich was set up from everlasting, from the beginning or ver the earth was.' This is the world of which we are eally certain, for it is the world of reason. The natural vorld we only know by sense, which often deceives us; for enses were not given us, as Malebranche says, to instruct ıs in truth, but merely to serve for the common uses of ife.

The Logos in all men.

This Logos by which the world exists is the light and the life of men. The Reason of God enlightens every man that comes into the world. Christ, or the Logos, is so intimately united to our minds that in Him we see all things. He is our light and wisdom, as He is the Light and Wisdom of the Father. He is 'the inward word and sub-

CHAP. IX.

stantial conception of our minds.'* This, in strict lo to make the reason of man and even his existence pa the reason and the existence of God. Augustine is q as saying, that 'rational minds have no other true but that very word of God by whom all things were made.' All men are participators of this reason, but in some it is actual, while in others it is only potential. The light shines in the darkness, but the darkness comprehends it not. This is paralleled by the corresponding use of the words salvation or saved. Christ has redeemed all men potentially, but actual salvation is only to them that believe. Norris quotes from Hierocles a passage to the same effect as the words in St. John. Jupiter tells Pythagoras that they only have the actual illumination who strive to be free from evil, and so purge their moral sense that they may see truth. Norris objects to the Quakers' doctrine of the 'light within,' that they make this light a creature, and not God Himself in His proper essence and being.†

John Ray.

John Ray, the naturalist, may also be classed with the theological writers of the latter part of the seventeenth century. He lost his fellowship at Trinity College through the Act of Uniformity, but remained in communion with the Church as a layman. Nothing so loudly proclaims the injustice and the folly of the Act of Uniformity as the ejection of John Ray. He had no insuperable objections to the constitution or discipline of the Church of England. He had never taken the Solemn League and Covenant. In 1660 he had voluntarily sought episcopal ordination from Bishop Sanderson. He might, with an effort, have subscribed to all that was required; but he could not swear that those who had taken the oath of the Covenant were not bound by their oath.

Belongs to the Royal Society.

Ray belongs properly to the Royal Society. After his ejection from the service of the Church, he devoted himself entirely to the study of nature. This study he connected with religion, in the spirit of Robert Boyle and Bishop Wilkins. He laid the foundation of natural theology in reason, gathering from the works of creation manifold evi-

* 'Treatises upon Several Subjects,' p. 199.

† *Ibid.* p. 437.

dences of the existence, the wisdom, and the goodness of Deity. He took the Scriptures as a revelation from God in the old sense that they were an infallible guide both in science and history. He studied nature to confirm the truth of what they taught. Noah's flood was proved from the sea-shells found on mountain tops, and the dissolution of the world by fire, as predicted by St. Peter, from the inflammability of the earth under the torrid zone. Ray had no genius for speculation. He made the natural theology of the eighteenth century, and that century was spent in studying it.

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER IX.

As the Unitarian controversy is somewhat intricate, a list of the principal tracts, in the order of their publication, may be of some service as a guide to the reader. The first two were 'The Brief History of the Unitarians,' 1689, and the 'Brief Notes on the Athanasian Creed,' 1689.

Sherlock's answer, called 'A Vindication of the Trinity,' etc., was published in 1690. This was followed, in 1691, by the first collection of Firmin's tracts, called 'The Faith of One God, who is only Father, and of One Mediator between God and Man, who is only the man Jesus, and of Holy Ghost, the gift (and sent) of God, Asserted and Defended,' etc. The volume contains:—

1. 'An Exhortation to a Free and Impartial Inquiry into the Doctrines of Religion.'

2. 'The Apostolical and True Opinion concerning the Holy Trinity Revived and Asserted,' etc. This is a republication of Bidle's tracts, dated 1548, with a life of John Bidle prefixed. They consist of the 'Letters to Sir H. V.,' the 'XII Arguments,' 'A Confession of Faith Concerning the Holy Trinity according to Scripture,' 'The T stimonies of Irenæus, Justin Martyr, Tertullian,' etc.

3. 'The Acts of Great Athanasius, with Notes by way of illustration on his Creed, and Observations on the Learned Vindication of the Trinity and Incarnation,' by Dr. William Sherlock.

4. 'Some Thoughts upon Dr. Sherlock's Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity,' in a letter, the second edition, with enlarge-

APPENDIX TO CHAP. IX.

ments. This tract condemns Sherlock for dealing in philosophy and metaphysics, it recommends keeping to Scripture language.

5. 'A Brief History of the Unitarians, called also Socinians, in Four Letters to a Friend.' The second edition, corrected, with some additions.

6. 'A Defence of the Brief History of the Unitarians against Dr. Sherlock's answer in his Vindication of the Holy Trinity.'

7. 'An Impartial Account of the Word Mystery, as it is taken in Holy Scripture.'

8. 'Dr. Wallis's Letter Touching the Doctrine of the Blessed Trinity Answered by his Friend.'

9. 'Observations on the Four Letters of Dr. John Wallis concerning the Trinity and the Creed of Athanasius.'

Some of these tracts are dated 1690. The tracts of the second collection are dated 1692–93, 'Proving the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ the only True God, and Jesus Christ the Son of God, Him whom the Father sanctified and sent, raised from the Dead, and Exalted, and Disproving the doctrine of Three Almighty and Equal Persons, Spirits, Modes, Subsistences, or Somewhats in God, and of the Incarnation.' This volume contains:—

1. 'A Letter of Resolution concerning the Doctrine of the Trinity and the Incarnation.'

2. 'Two Letters Touching the Trinity and Incarnation.'

3. 'An Accurate Examination of the Principal Texts usually alleged for the Divinity of our Saviour, and for the satisfaction, etc., occasioned by a book of Mr. L. Milbourn, called Mysteries (in Religion) Vindicated.'

4. 'Reflections on Two Discourses concerning the Divinity of our Saviour, written by M. Lamothe, in French, and done into English.'

5. 'The Trinitarian Scheme of Religion concerning Almighty God and Mankind considered, both Before and After the Fall, with Notes thereupon, which Notes contain also the Unitarian Scheme.'

6. 'Of Worshipping the Holy Ghost expressly as a Person equal to, and distinct from, the Father.'

7. 'The Unreasonableness of the Doctrine of the Trinity briefly Demonstrated.'

8. 'The Belief of the Athanasian Creed not required by the Church of England as necessary to Salvation.'

9. 'Mr. Chillingworth's Judgment of the Religion of Protestants.'

10. 'Considerations on the Explications of the Doctrine of the Trinity, by Dr. Wallis, Dr. Sherlock, Dr. S—th, Dr. Cudworth, and Mr. Hooker, as also on the Account given by those that say the Trinity is an Inconceivable and Inexplicable Mystery, written to a Person of Quality.'

Another volume contains a third collection of tracts with the dates of 1694–95.

1. 'Considerations on the Explications of the Doctrine of the Trinity, Occasioned by Four Sermons Preached by His Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury; A Sermon preached by the Lord Bishop of Worcester; A Discourse by the Lord Bishop of Salisbury; A Sheet by a very Learned Hand, containing Twenty-Eight Propositions; a Treatise by an eminent Dissenting Minister, being a Calm Discourse concerning the Possibility of a Trinity; and by a Book in Answer to the Animadversions on Dr. Sherlock's Vindication of the Trinity, in a letter to H. H.'

2. 'Animadversions on a Postscript to the Defence of Dr. Sherlock Against the Calm Discourse of the Sober Enquirer, as also on the Letter to a Friend Concerning the Postscript.'

3. 'A Letter to the Reverend the Clergy of both Universities Concerning the Trinity and the Athanasian Creed, with Reflections on all the Late Hypotheses, Particularly Dr. W.'s and Dr. S—th's; The Trinity placed in its True Light; The Twenty-Eight Propositions; The Calm Discourse of a Trinity in the Godhead, and a Defence of Dr. Sherlock's Notions, with a Short Discourse Concerning Mysteries.'

4. 'The Reflections on the Twenty-Eight Propositions Touching the Doctrine of the Trinity, in a Letter to the Clergy, and Maintained Against the Third Defence of the said Propositions,' by the Same Hand.

5. 'A Reply to the Second Defence of the Twenty-Eight Proposition, said to be writ in Answer to a Socinian Manuscript.' By the author of that M.S. No Socinian, but a Christian and Unitarian.

6. 'The Exceptions of Mr. Edwards in his Causes of Atheism against the Reasonableness of Christianity, as delivered in the Scriptures Examined, etc.'

7. 'The Judgment of the Fathers concerning the Doctrine of the Trinity Opposed to Dr. G. Bull's Defence of the Nicene Faith.'

8. 'A Discourse concerning the Nominal and Real Trinitarian.'

Besides these three series of Firmin's tracts, there were other single tracts of the same dates on this controversy. The following is a list of some of the more important on both sides:—

APPENDIX TO CHAP. IX.

'An Answer to an Anonymous Pamphleteer who Impugns th Doctrine contained in the Creed of St. Athanasius,' 1690.

'A Vindication of the Unitarians against a late Reverer Author on the Trinity,' 1690.

'Tractatus de Vera Christi Deitate adversus Arii et Socin Hæreses,' (Whitby) 1691.

'An Answer to Dr. Wallis's Four Letters concerning the Doctrine of the Trinity,' 1691.

'A Calm and Sober Enquiry Concerning the Possibility of Trinity in the Godhead, Occasioned by the lately published Con siderations on the Explications of the Doctrine of the Trinity, b Dr. Wallis, Dr. Sherlock, Dr. S—th, Dr. Cudworth, etc., together with Certain Letters (hitherto unpublished) formerly writte to the Rev. Dr. Wallis on the same Subject.' By John Howe.

'A Letter to a Friend Concerning the Postscript to the Defen of Dr. Sherlock's Notion of the Trinity in Unity, relating to th Calm and Sober Enquiry upon the same Subject.' (John Howe.

'A View of that Part of the late Considerations Addressed t H. H., about the Trinity, which Concerns the Sober Enquiry c that Subject.'

'Animadversions on a Postscript to the Defence of Dr. She lock Against the Calm Discourse of the Sober Enquirer, as als on a Letter to a Friend concerning that Postscript.'

'The Antapology of the Melancholy Stander-By in Answer t the Dean of St. Paul's late Book, falsely styled an Apology f Writing against Socinians,' 1693.

'Brief Observations upon the Vindication of the Trinity an Incarnation, by the Learned Dr. W. Sherlock.'

'Some Thoughts upon Dr. Sherlock's Vindication of the Do trine of the Holy Trinity.'

'A Letter to the Rev. Dr. South upon Occasion of a late Boo entitled Animadversions upon Dr. Sherlock's Book in Vindication of the Trinity,' (Sherlock) 1693.

'The Socinian Controversie Touching the Son of God Reduced in a Brief Essay, to Prove the Son One in Essence with the Father, upon Socinian Principles, Concessions and Reason; Con cluded with an Humble and Serious Caution to the Friends o the Church of England against the Approaches of Socinianism By F. Fullwood, D.D., 1693.

'An Answer to the Brief History of the Socinian ' By Wi liam Basset, Rector of St. Swithin's, 1693.

'An Apology for Writing Against the Socinians in Defence o the Doctrines of the Holy Trinity and Incarnation.' By Dr. She lock, 1693.

'A Defence of Dr. Sherlock's Notion of a Trinity in Unity, in Answer to Animadversions, etc., with a Postscript relating to the Calm Discourse of a Trinity in the Godhead,' (Sherlock) 1694.

'Certain Propositions by which the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity is so Explained according to the Ancient Fathers, as to Speak it not Contradictory to Natural Reason, together with a Defence of them in Answer to the Objections of a Socinian, written in the Newly-printed Considerations on the Explications of the Trinity Occasioned by the Propositions,' (Fowler) 1694.

'An Account of the Blessed Trinity Argued from the Nature and Perfection of the Supreme Spirit coincident with the Scripture Doctrine in all the Articles of the Catholic Creeds, together with its Mystical, Fœderal, and Primary Uses in the Catholic Church.' By William Burrough, 1694.

'A Modest Examination of the late Discourse of the Vice-Chancellor of Oxford, etc., concerning the Theory of Three Distinct Infinite Minds in the Holy and Ever Blessed Trinity.' By William Sherlock, D.D., 1694.

'The Doctrine of the Fathers and Schools Considered, etc., in Answer to the Animadversions of the Dean of St. Paul's Vindication of the Doctrine of the Holy and Ever Blessed Trinity.' By J. B., 1695.

'A Second Defence of the Propositions, etc., together with a Third Defence of these Propositions in Answer to the Newly-Published Reflections Contained in a Pamphlet Entitled a Letter to the Reverend the Clergy of both Universities,' 1695.

'Remarks by a University Man upon a late Book Falsely Called a Vindication of the Primitive Fathers Against the Imputations of Gilbert Burnet, Lord Bishop of Sarum,' 1695.

'A Vindication of the Sermons of His Grace John Archbishop Canterbury, etc., of the Bishop of Worcester's Sermon on the Mysteries of the Christian Faith from the Exceptions of a late Book entitled Considerations on the Explications of the Doctrine of the Trinity to which is annexed a Letter from the Lord Bishop of Sarum to the Author of the Second Vindication on the same Subject,' 1695.

'Remarks upon the Examination of the Oxford Decree.' By Jonathan Edwards, Principal of Jesus College, Oxford, 1695.

'The Judgment of a Disinterested Person Concerning the Controversy about the Trinity Depending Between Dr. S—th and Dr. Sherlock,' 1696.

'A Modest Examination of the Authority and Reasons of the Late Decree of the Vice Chancellor of Oxford and some Heads of

APPENDIX TO CHAP. IX.

Colleges and Halls, concerning the Heresy of Three Distin Infinite Minds in the Holy and Ever Blessed Trinity.' By W liam Sherlock, D.D., Dean of St. Paul's, Master of the Templ and Chaplain in Ordinary to Her Majesty, 1696.

'Eye-Salve Recommended to the World, in a Short Essay Occasioned by the Sight of a Discourse Set Forth since th King's Injunction Concerning the Trinity,' 1696.

'Some Considerations concerning the Trinity, and the Ways o Managing that Controversy,' 1696.

'The Doctrine of the Catholic Church, and of the Church o England, Concerning the Blessed Trinity, Explained and Asserted Against Dangerous Heterdoxes, in a Sermon by Dr. William Sherlock before my Lord Mayor and the Court of Aldermen,' 1697. This is also called 'Remarks upon Dr. William Sherlock's (false and treacherous) Defence of some Principal Articles of Faith, in a Sermon before my Lord Mayor and the Court of Aldermen, April 25, 1697.'

'Sermon Preached at Colchester by H. De Luzancy. To which are prefixed some Remarks on the Socinian's late Answer to the Four Letters Written Against them by the same Author.' 1697.

'The Divine Unity Once More Asserted,' 1697.

'The Agreement of Unitarians with the Catholic Church Answer to Mr. Edwards, the Bishops of Chichester, Worcester, Sarum, and Mons. de Luzancy,' 1697.

'The Grounds and Occasions of the Controversy Concerning the Unity of God,' etc. By a Divine of the Church of England 1698.

'A Letter to a Friend, with Remarks upon the Pamphlets lately published in Defence of Tritheism, a Brief Enquiry by J. T., and the Socinian Slain,' by J. H., 1700.

'The Moderate Trinitarian.' By Daniel Allen, 1699.

'The Arian's Vindication of Himself against Dr. Wallis's Fifth Letter on the Trinity.'

'A Vindication of Dr. Sherlock's Sermon concerning the Danger of Corrupting the Faith by Philosophy, in Answer to some Socinian Remarks,' 1697.

'A Preservative against Socinianism.' By Jonathan Edwards, 1698.

Some of these tracts, along with others not named here, are included in volumes called fourth, fifth, and sixth collections. An account of them will be found in 'Anti-Trinitarian Biography,' by Robert Wallace.

CHAPTER X.

ACT OF TOLERATION.—LOCKE'S LETTERS ON TOLERATION.—COMPREHENSION BILL.—THE QUAKERS.—WILLIAM PENN.—ROBERT BARCLAY.—GEORGE KEITH ANSWERS PENN AND BARCLAY.—CHARLES LESLIE AGAINST THE QUAKERS.—THE BAPTISTS.—JOHN BUNYAN.—ON REPROBATION.—THE SABBATH.—CLOSE COMMUNION.—DANIEL DE FOE AGAINST OCCASIONAL CONFORMITY.—ANSWERS BY JOHN HOWE AND VISCOUNT BARRINGTON.—BILL AGAINST OCCASIONAL CONFORMITY.—BURNET'S SPEECH AGAINST THE BILL.—BAXTER, BATES, AND HOWE'S UNWILLING SEPARATION FROM THE CHURCH.—SAMUEL CLARKE ON 'DIVINE AUTHORITY OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.'—UNITARIANISM AMONG THE PRESBYTERIANS.—THOMAS EMLYN.

THE accession of William and Mary begins a new era for Nonconformists, as well as for the Church of England. In the first year of this reign they had a legal existence secured by the Act of Toleration. Nonconformist ministers were to subscribe thirty-four of the Thirty-nine Articles. Special arrangements were made for Baptists and Quakers, but Roman Catholics and Unitarians were beyond the pale. It was still penal to teach transubstantiation, or to deny the Divinity of Christ.

The Act of Toleration.

John Locke vindicated the Act of Toleration, but lamented its imperfection. Toleration was an old subject, and had often been discussed since the Reformation. In Locke's judgment there was no nation under heaven in which so much had been said on it as ours, and 'no people that stood in more need of having something further both said and done amongst them on this point than we do.'* It is easy

Vindicated by John Locke.

* First Letter on Toleration. To the Reader.

CHAP. X.

to draw many inferences on this subject to serve party i terests, but it is not always easy to trace the abstra principles on which toleration was denied. There are son obvious cases in which it was due purely to an arbitrary exercise of power, sometimes on the part of the sovereign, and sometimes on the part of the Church. But in many cases it had political or religious reasons; and in every case these were not the same. 'Our government,' Locke say 'has not only been partial in matters of religion, but thos also who have suffered under that partiality, and have therefore endeavoured by their writings to vindicate their ow rights and liberties, have for the most part done it upon narrow principles, suited to the interests of their own sects.' The exceptions to this are some of the great writers of the Church of England, as Taylor, Stillingfleet, and Tillotson, who advocated toleration for all who were not idolaters.

The Church of England and the civil magistrate.

The Church of England has no doctrine of the duty of the civil magistrate in religion beyond that of protecting th safety of the commonwealth. There are traces in th writings of some of the Reformers that they regarded th king as taking the place which had been held by the Pop Some even said that to the civil ruler was committed th care of the souls of his subjects. There are also individu theologians who have held it to be the duty of the State to defend the truth and to oppose all error; but the Church of England in itself authorizes no interference of the magi trate with the religious opinions of the people, except so far as they are supposed to be dangerous to the welfare of the State. The necessities of self-defence demanded the entire exclusion of the Church of Rome. The Puritans were persecuted for nonconformity, but the argument for their persecution involved the charge that nonconformity itself was disloyalty to the sovereign. The Presbyterians first distinctly taught that the civil magistrate was to establish truth and extirpate error. The Independents, however, were too strong for the Presbyterians. Under Cromwell toleration was professedly given to all, 'provided this liberty be not extended to Popery or Prelacy.' The Quakers and some other new sects were included, but practically toleration never reached them.

Locke advocated 'absolute liberty.' He wished it to be just and true, equal and impartial.' He founded his arguments on an analysis of the duties and objects of civil governments as distinct from those of religious communities. Force, he said, which is the foundation of a commonwealth, can have no place in religion. The magistrate has to protect the lives and property of his subjects, but he cannot have the care of their souls, for true or saving religion can only come from an inward persuasion. The Church is altogether distinct from the State. It is founded on belief. The magistrates cannot enforce religious doctrines, because they are beyond the reach of absolute certainty. Even the fundamental articles of the Christian religion cannot be demonstrated; they are matters of faith, not of knowledge. The magistrate, therefore, 'must be content with faith and persuasion.' *

The duties of the State distinct from those of the Church.

Locke's position was precisely that of the Church of England. His arguments were addressed only to the Presbyterians and such Churchmen as held that the civil magistrate was bound to punish heresy. He did not deny all connection between the Church and the State. Some relations, such for instance as those for mutual self-protection, he held to be inevitable. Locke nowhere opposes the State Church principle. He simply advocates freedom and the utmost toleration. In the 'Laws of Carolina' he objected to an article which provided that the Church of England be supported by a grant from parliament. But he did not wish the State to be without a religion. Contrary, perhaps, to his own principle of absolute liberty, he made a statute that 'no person above seventeen years of age shall have any benefit or protection of the law, or be capable of any place of profit or honour, who is not a member of some church or profession.' He allowed, however, a wide scope for the creeds of churches, requiring no indispensable articles of faith beyond belief in God, and that He is to be worshipped.

Locke's doctrine of Church and State that of the Church of England.

The Bill of Toleration was accompanied by a Bill of Comprehension. Both bills had the approbation of the nonjuring bishops. Could we regard them as purely the

The Bill of Comprehension.

* Works, vol. v. p. 144. Ed. 1824.

CHAP. X.

acts of the State Church, they might be explained on t principle of giving freedom as soon as freedom was compa tible with the safety of the State. The loyalty of Protesta Nonconformists to the constitution had been demonstrate But, in addition to this, toleration of the Nonconformists ha become a necessity in presence of the common enem There were doubtless men, like Tillotson and Locke, wh advocated liberty of conscience far beyond what was grante by the Act of Toleration. But all were agreed that toler tion itself was in danger if there was to be no check on th Church of Rome. Locke argued, that though idolatr might be tolerated, yet the Church of Rome could no because of the principle that no faith is to be kept wit heretics. Tillotson told the House of Commons in a ser mon that it was their duty to make effectual provisio 'against the propagation of Popery, which was more mis chievous than irreligion itself.'

The Comprehension Bill was the last effort for the restora tion of Dissenters. Its history illustrates the position of th different parties at the final parting with the Nonconformist

Its provisions. It proposed virtually what Baxter and his party had aske in 1662. Instead of assent and consent to all and every thing in the Prayer Book, there was to be substituted general approval of the doctrine and discipline of th Church of England. The use of the surplice, the cross in baptism, and kneeling at the communion, were not to b compulsory. As the changes affected the liturgy and the canons, the Lords petitioned their Majesties for a Roya Commission to prepare the necessary alterations. The Commission was not to exceed thirty persons, who were to be chosen from the bishops and clergy only. This limitation was opposed, but when it came to the vote the numbers were equal, and so the amendment for the admission of laymen was lost. The Commons ordered the bill to lie on the table, and passed a resolution that the King be requested to summon the Houses of Convocation. This was seconded by the Lords, and so the bill passed entirely out of the hands of the laity, to be dealt with only by the clergy.

There were reasonable hopes that at this time, even, the Houses of Convocation would have been willing to promote

a scheme of comprehension. The suggestion of leaving the bill to Convocation is said to have originated with Tillotson. He believed the Church to be capable of liberty, and he wished to remove the reproach that it was merely the creature of the State. He was deceived. The bishops, indeed, showed themselves for the most part equal to the occasion, ıt the Lower House too faithfully represented the ignorance and passion of the inferior clergy. Dr. Beveridge preached before the Convocation against change, and Dr. Jane, the High Church leader, was chosen Prolocutor of the Lower House instead of Tillotson, who had expected the office without opposition. The scheme of revision was prepared, but to present it before such an assembly as had met ı the Lower House would have been labour obviously in vain.*

Its history.

The commission consisted of ten bishops and twenty divines.† They had been chosen with some care and different parties were fairly represented. Some of those named ı the commission never came, and others came but seldom. Dr. Williams, who kept a diary of the proceedings, says, that on one occasion there were only seven or eight present, while nine were required to constitute a quorum. At the next meeting, Sprat, of Rochester, who had been in trouble through serving on an illegal commission under James, expressed doubts of the legality of the present commission, and fears of a premunire. There had not been quorum at the last meeting, and many of those named in he commission as deans and prebendaries had since been

The Royal Commission.

* Dr. Jane was a declared enemy f William and all his schemes. He ıd been chosen by the University of xford to present their plate to the rince, when he took the opportunity f asking the bishopric of Exeter. It ..ad already been promised to Trelawney, and was therefore refused to ane.

† The bishops were Lamplugh of York; Compton of London; Lloyd of St. Asaph; Sprat of Rochester; Smith f Carlisle; Trelawney of Exeter; Burnet of Salisbury; Humphreys of Bangor; Mew of Winchester; and Stratford of Chester. The divines vere Stillingfleet, Dean of St. Paul's; Patrick, Dean of Peterborough; Tillotson, Dean of Canterbury; Meggot, Dean of Winchester; Sharp, Dean of Norwich; Montague, Master of Trinity, Cambridge; Goodman, Archdeacon of Middlesex; Beveridge, Archdeacon of Colchester; Batteley, Archdeacon of Canterbury; Alston, Archdeacon of Essex; Kidder, Rector of St. Martin's Outwich; Aldrich, Dean of Christ Church; Jane, Regius Professor of Divinity, Oxford; Beaumont, Regius Professor, Cambridge; Tenison, Archdeacon of Lincoln; Fowler, a Prebendary of Gloucester; Scott, Grove, and Williams, Prebendaries of St. Paul's.

CHAP. X.

made bishops. His fingers, he said, had already been bi and he was afraid of fire. Patrick tried to convince . that the commissions were unlike. Their present busin was only to make recommendations. They had now corrupt judges, and there was no danger of coming i collision with any secret designs of the king. Mew, Winchester, who had also been on the former commissi agreed with Sprat. Aldrich and Jane suddenly left meeting and never again appeared on the commission. old questions, which had been the occasion of Nonconfo ist scruples, were all thoroughly discussed. Regenerat by baptism in some sense was found to be the doctrine all reformed Churches. Dr. Fowler wished the use of Athanasian Creed to be optional, because of the damnat clauses. It is said that many Conformists holding hi stations in the Church had long ceased to use it, and t the Nonconformists now objected to all creeds which were written in Scripture language. Ordination was discus under three forms, that of the Roman Catholics, that the Foreign Protestant Churches, and that of the Dissente

Their discussions.

The validity of the first was doubted, because in the Chu of Rome there is no imposition of hands till the ordinati is completed. It was agreed, therefore, that those ordain by the Church of Rome should be re-ordained hypothe cally. As to foreign orders, it was shown that those w were ordained bishops for the sees in Scotland under Jam I. had not to be re-ordained presbyters. Bishop Andrew indeed, had objected to their consecration without re-ord nation, but he yielded to the judgment of the king. was therefore decided that for those who had been ordaine by presbyters in Foreign Churches, it would be sufficie to give authority by imposition of hands to officiate in t Church of England. The case of the English Dissente was compared to that of the African Donatists. Th Catholic Church acknowledged their ordinations for th healing of the schism. For the present distress, this sam might be done with the Nonconformists. Dr. Beveridg objected that the Donatists had bishops, though they were i schism, which could not be said of the English Dissenter This was answered by the argument that the Donati

_ishops could not have been true bishops, as there could not be two bishops in one diocese. The case, therefore, of the Donatists was allowed to be parallel to that of those ordained by presbyters.

Changes in the Prayer Book.

The changes proposed in the Prayer Book were very numerous. For the ambiguous word 'priest,' presbyter or minister was everywhere to be substituted. Daily service was recommended, but not in every case to be obligatory. Sunday was to be always called 'the Lord's Day.' The apocryphal lessons were to be excluded from the lectionary, and all the obscure or legendary saints to be deprived of their fasts and festivals. The eight beatitudes of Jesus were sometimes to be read in the Communion service, instead of the Ten Commandments. It was said that the words 'by baptism,' before the word 'regenerate,' in the baptismal service, were added by the printer in the time of James I. It was therefore right that this error of the printer should be corrected. The sign of the cross was not to be made if the parents wished it to be omitted, or if the minister scrupled to use it. But in the case of parents desiring its use, an incumbent who had scruples about it, was to have a curate who had none. 'Verily and indeed received,' in the catechism, was to be changed so as to read, that not the body and the blood of Christ were verily and indeed received, but the benefits of His sacrifice. There was to be a second and shorter form of the burial service to be used in special cases, at the option of the minister, and 'the sure and certain hope,' was to be changed into a firm belief. Dr. Kidder had prepared a new version of the Psalms, but the commission had not time to examine it.

The Nonconformists satisfied.

Baxter, Bates, Calamy, Howe, and all the moderate Nonconformists were satisfied with this scheme. It was frustrated, as we have seen, by the High Churchmen. Some supposed that these changes which would have reconciled the Puritans would have strengthened the schism of the Nonjurors. Tillotson and the liberal party, who wished the Church to embrace the nation, were defeated. But South and his friends rejoiced that the 'rabble' had been excluded, and the 'thief' prevented from getting an easy entrance by the church door.*

* Sermons, vol. v. p. 486.

CHAP. X.

Sects beyond the reach of comprehension.

By the time of the Revolution, two sects, which no E of Comprehension could touch, had become numerous ar important. These were the Quakers and the Baptist Both of them had their origin as sects in the time of th Commonwealth, and both had retained the character o thorough Dissenters. The Presbyterian and the Inde pendent had no scruples which, with an effort or for th sake of peace and unity, might not have been overcom But the Quaker and the Baptist had separated for principl which made their restoration impossible. To these tw sects we must look specially for the history of religiou thought among Nonconformists. It will be found that the differed from each other as much as from the Church, ar that they hated each other even more, if possible, than the hated the Church. To make inferences is not our presen business, but the fact is not to be omitted that the sam latitudinarian theology and the same stringent orthodox which found advocates within the Church, also found advo cates among the Nonconformists.

The Quakers.

The Quakers are the sect which, before all others, is to b regarded as the peculiar product of the times of the Com monwealth. They seized on principles which were common perhaps in a wilder form, to other sects of that time whic were soon extinct. The superiority of the spirit to th letter, of the inward conscience to the outward law, wa the distinguishing tenet of Familists, Ranters, and Seekers The principle was a rational one, though these sects were extravagant and fantastic. The same may be said of th early Quakers. George Fox and his first disciples began their career chiefly as disturbers of other people's devotions Many things, indeed, were laid to their charge which were not true, but that they were extravagant is not to be denied.*

* The testimonies to this are numerous. The following passages from Penn's 'Reply to a Nameless Author' is evidence not to be disputed, while it gives the Quaker judgment of toleration under the Commonwealth. The nameless author had said that some of the Quaker women went naked, to which Penn answers,—'Some of our friends have gone naked for a sign to this generation, in token of God's *stripping* some persecutors of their power, and, in particular, that generation of the clergy that preceded the Restoration, which, having risen through persecution, forgot their pleas when they had power towards those that dissented from them, and testified against the same evils in them that they had justly inveighed against in the former bishops' days.'—Works, vol. v. p. 106.

CHAP. X.

Pretend a Divine commission.

The Quakers believed that they had an immediate divine commission to destroy the corrupt Churches of that day, and to introduce the era of the saints.* It is easy to compare this commission to that of Lodowick Muggleton, when he professed to silence all the clergy in London and Westminster. It is also easy to find in the Quaker doctrine the germ of a rational theology which brings Scripture to the test of a 'verifying faculty' within. But in both cases he might be wrong. The early Quakers had the same reverence for the Scriptures as other Christians. They received them as a rule of faith, and what they taught as that which no new revelation could contradict. They were inspired and infallible. George Fox calls them 'the most authentic and perfect declaration of Christian faith, being indited by the Holy Spirit of God that never errs.'† Many passages to the same effect might be quoted from other writers. That they under-estimated or in any way disparaged the Scriptures was merely an inference from their doctrine of the Spirit.

The Quakers and the Bible.

There was, however, a sense in which Quakerism was a protest against bibliolatry. The necessities of the Protestant argument required inspiration, so far as it meant positive teaching, to be confined to the Scriptures. There was here at least a tendency to limit inspiration to one age, and to suppose that the spirits of men had no inspiration now. The Church of Rome had always maintained the immediate inspiration of the Church along with the inspiration of the Scriptures. The High Anglican, too, in a vague sense believed that the Church was inspired. The Puritan held to individual inspiration in the sense that the Divine Spirit witnessed to the inspiration of the Scriptures, and enlightened the minds of the saints to understand what the Scriptures meant. He made, indeed, a distinction for which he had no authority between the kind of inspiration given to those who wrote the Scriptures and that which is given to all Christians. He was eager, also, to give a peculiar homage to the Scriptures by calling them 'the

* The evidence of this is abundant in the tracts of the first Quakers. Some of these are quoted in 'The Peculium' (a Quaker Prize Essay), by Thomas Hancock.

† 'Answer to all such as falsely say the Quakers are no Christians,' p. 26.

CHAP. X.

Word of God.' The Quakers were willing to call t 'the words of God,' but the other title was already ap priated to One who was above all Scriptures. It is poss that in the ultimate of the argument, the Quaker doctrin the Spirit may be found not to be really different from that of the Puritan. The apparent difference is that the Puritan applied his understanding to the Scriptures as his ordinary guide, while the Quaker waited for a voice from within.

The second generation of Quakers had some educated men who explained and defended their doctrines with more accuracy than had been done by Fox and his immediate followers. The chief of these were William Penn and Robert Barclay. Their works may be taken as authentic expositions of the Quaker faith, so far as the works of individuals can represent the belief of a community which does not require subscription to any creeds. Penn's history is another of the many instances of the preponderating influence of religious feelings altogether independent of the particular opinions with which they may be connected. was apparently a deeply religious man, converted in same sense as Augustine or Bunyan. For his attachm to the Quakers, whom he regarded as the chosen people these latter days, he was disinherited by his father. believed in eternal punishment in the ordinary sense these words, and that this punishment was for those w enjoyed the world, and did not live the religious life of Quaker. He was pious, too, in the sense of believing wit out too strict an exercise of the faculty of mere reasonin In an epistle to the 'Little Flock,' he says, 'O let not t foolishness of the Cross be over-reasoned, cavilled, and di puted. A willing offering, resigned spirit, and content bearer of the reproach of men for conscience' sake, su God loves.'*

William Penn.

His theology.

But Penn's theology, judged by the standard of the orthodox churches, was altogether heresy. He rejected the terms in which the doctrine of the Trinity is expressed in the creeds. A Trinity of separate persons in a unity of essence he refuted from Scripture. One in substance but three in subsistence he called an 'impertinent distinction;'† for if there be

* Works, vol. i. p. 44.

† Vol. i. p. 30.

ıree persons there must be three substances. The distinc- ıon, he said, was born three hundred years after the Scrip- ures were written. It originated with the 'too daring :uriosity of the Bishop of Alexandria.' It was unknown o 'Irenæus, Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Origen, and some thers.'

The doctrines usually connected with the Trinity are disposed of in the same fashion. The mercy of God in forgiving sin without regard to satisfaction is set forth by many passages of Scripture. It is called an absurdity to ay that God forgives, and yet requires the debt to be fully paid. Man can forgive without satisfaction, and surely much more can God. If He so loved the world that He gave His Son, it cannot be said that He stood afar off till Christ made a complete satisfaction to offended justice. By many arguments Penn proves this doctrine to be 'irre- igious and irrational.' It divests God of His power to pardon transgression, and teaches a licentiousness unbe- coming the Gospel of Christ. The doctrine of imputed righteousness is also refuted. Many passages from Scrip- ture are quoted, which declare that God will condemn the wicked only, and justify none but the righteous. The doers of the law shall be justified. It is said to be contrary to God's nature to accept the ungodly, because of the impu- tation of another's righteousness. Penn concludes with a caution not to mistake his meaning. He does not deny 'a Father, Word, and Spirit,' but only the inventions of men which are not in the Scriptures.* The Trinity of the orthodox has been, he says, the occasion of idolatry, a scandal to Turks, Jews, and Infidels, and a stumbling- block in the way of their reception of the Christian faith. As to satisfaction, Penn does not deny that Christ in His life and death fulfilled the will of His Father, and offered up a 'satisfactory sacrifice;' but it was not, he says, 'to

On satisfaction for sin,

and imputed righteousness.

* After quoting St. Paul's words, 'Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God,' Penn says that from this he concludes 'Christ the Saviour to be God;' for otherwise God would not be Himself, since, if Christ be distinct from God and yet God's power and wisdom, God would be without His own power and wisdom; but inasmuch as it is impossible, God's power and wisdom should be distinctly divided from Himself, it reasonably follows that Christ who is that power and wisdom is not distinct from God, but entirely the very same God.'—Vol. I. p. 61.

CHAP. X.

pay God, or help Him to save men,'* or to justify the because of an imputed righteousness. A measure of gra is given to every man, and he that uses the grace give will be led out of unrighteousness, and when he is real just God will justify him.

'The Sandy Foundation Shaken' was the name of tl treatise in which Penn first set forth these doctrines. H was immediately charged with Socinianism, and wrote i vindication of himself, 'Innocency with Her Open Face He refused the epithet 'Socinian,' but he expressed a gre respect for the memory of Socinus, and believed that i many things he had a clearer view of the truth than mo... of his contemporaries. On satisfaction he quoted Stilling-fleet, who, in his treatise against Crellius, admits it was possible for God to pardon sin without satisfaction. The end of Christ's redemption was to make men righteous h— an inward purification. Whoever, Penn says, believes Christ shall have remission of sins and justification, but the faith must be a faith which comprehends obedience. The only that 'fear His name and keep His commandmen shall have right to the tree of life.' Christ is within. I tabernacles in men. To hear His voice, to be led by Hi so as to forsake the vanities of the world, is to have righ eousness, sanctification, and redemption. In another pla Penn says that the Quakers utterly renounce and reject t common acceptation of salvation that it is merely to be saved from punishment hereafter. It is rather to be regenerated and renewed, in the words of Scripture saved from sin.†

Denies that satisfaction was necessary.

'Christ within.'

The 'Christ within' is said to be in all men. The obvious objection to this doctrine was, that if the light is in all men, why are so many in darkness? Penn answered by distinguishing between the efficiency of the light, and rebellion against it. Some are obedient to the light. Many of the heathens were,—as Plato, Plotinus, Seneca, Epictetus, and Antoninus. Some are disobedient. St. Paul was before his conversion. He resisted the Holy Ghost, kicking against the pricks of conscience which were the convictions of the light of Christ. This St. Paul, in the

* Vol. I. p. 54. † Vol. I. p. 149.

Epistle to the Galatians, calls the revelation of the Son of God within him. It was not admitted to be an argument against the sufficiency of this light that all men were not enlightened. Blindness in man does not prove the insufficiency of the light of the sun. Those who make this objection say that Scripture is sufficient to give the knowledge of God, yet all who have the Scriptures have not this knowledge.

The Spirit and the Scriptures.

Another difficulty connected with the Quaker doctrine of the light within, was to determine definitely what the Spirit taught. Where are the actions it prescribes, or the rticles of faith which it inculcates? Does it teach anything not already taught in the Scriptures? or supposing we had no Scriptures, is its teaching sufficient? This is putting the question in the ordinary form. The answer subjects the Scriptures to the Spirit, making the inspiration of the writers of the Bible the same in kind as the inspiration of other men. This, in fact, as explained by Penn, is an education. A schoolmaster is not reckoned indifferent because he does not teach at once all he knows. The pupils can only make progress according to their capacity and their willingness to learn. The Scriptures, exclusive of the Spirit, can teach nothing. All the wise men in the world could not find out the meaning but by the light of Christ in the soul. It is, therefore, to the Spirit that we owe even that which we learn from the Scriptures.

Is the Spirit enough without the Scriptures?

The objection was pressed back to the case of those who ved before Christ. They had not all the Scriptures which we have, and at one time they had no Scriptures at all. he question was asked where the light was then? Could any be saved by the light of Christ, when Christ was not known? The question had already been answered in what was said of the wise men among the heathen. In the present treatise,* Penn answers it in detail. Adam was reated in God's image, and God is light. The Divine light must have been in him, for he was the image of that light. To this Moses referred the Israelites when he said that the word was nigh them, even in their hearts, and of this the Psalmist speaks, where he says, 'Thou art my lamp, O

* 'The Christian Quaker.'

CHAP. X.

Lord, for the Lord will lighten my darkness;' and Job, in his affliction cries out, 'O that it were with me as in months past, in the days when God preserved me, when His *candle shined* upon my head.' The path of the just is described by David as the shining light, which shineth more and more unto the perfect day. This, Penn says, implies that David regarded all the just men in all ages as guided by the Divine Spirit. To this St. Paul testifies in his Epistle to the Romans, where he says of the heathen that they knew that which may be known of God, for God hath manifested it unto them. It is shown, after the fashion of Lord Herbert, that the heathen knew all the great principles, or doctrines of religion. The sublimest passages of Scripture concerning the one God are paralleled by passages from Pagan authors. Pythagoras and Plato, Socrates and Cleanthes, believed in conscience as the light of God in the soul of man. It is further shown by many quotations that the Pagan philosophers were virtuous men, that they believed in the immortality of the soul and the recompenses of the life to come. Penn does not stop with allowing the heathen merely a knowledge of what is called natural religion. He maintains

The Pagans had the light within.

that they 'had a knowledge of Christ's coming, and anticipated His teaching.' Socrates and Xenophon objected to swearing, and Jesus said, 'Swear not at all.' They did not know the names by which Christ should be called, but they knew that He was to be born of a virgin. Ficinus records of Plato, that being asked how long men should attend to his writings, he answered, 'Till that more Holy and Divine Person shall appear to visit the world, whom all men ought to follow.' Virgil, as interpreted by Eusebius, had prophesied in many places of Christ, even declaring His virgin birth. To an assertion that Christ was not formerly called the light, Penn answers that in strict language Christ is not, but that the light in every man is *of* or *from* Christ. The justice of God requires that the light be universal and sufficient. The coming of Christ in the flesh, that is the historical Christ, might seem on Penn's theory to be unnecessary. Perhaps in strict reasoning it was. But the contrary of this is maintained. It is even said of Christ's death that it propitiated God, that it 'drew God's love the more eminently

nto mankind, at least such as should believe on His name.'* CHAP. X.

Which is the rule of faith, the Spirit or the Scriptures?

The first form of the Quaker controversy was necessarily the question of the rule of faith, is it the Bible or the Spirit? Penn said that that could not be a general rule which was not universal. He had shown that the teaching of the Spirit was universal, but all men had not the Scriptures. They were not then the rule always and everywhere. If granting what some maintained that they are now the rule to us, yet it can only be as a particular rule in subordination to a general rule. But the faith being something inward and spiritual, no mere book can be a rule. The Scriptures, moreover, are now imperfect. We have not the book of Enoch, several books mentioned in the Old Testament, as those of Nathan, Jasher, Jehu, Paul's Epistle to the Laodiceans, and the gospels of which St. Luke speaks in the preface to his history of Christ. The whole character of the Scriptures, the manner of their compilation, and the nature of their contents prevent us supposing that they were ever intended for a general rule. Who knows when they speak properly or metaphorically, literally or mystically? They contain many things hard to be understood, to be discerned only by the *spiritual* man, and therefore they cannot be a general rule of faith. It cannot be said that the originals are the rule, for we have none. If the copies, it is to be wished that we knew which of them were nearest to the original. The various readings are very numerous. The copies failing, we cannot surely turn to the translations which differ not only from the copies but from each other. The first collection of the books was made by the Council of Laodicea, 360 years after Christ. That collection was not the same as our Canon. The authority of the Scriptures as a whole must depend either on the Church or on inspiration. The Church is rejected by Protestants. There remains, therefore, only inspiration, which is that for which the Quakers contend. It was shown from the writings of the Reformers and the Puritans that they regarded the assistance of the Spirit as necessary to understand the Scriptures. But the question as to what the Spirit teaches, independently of the Scriptures, is still un-

* P. 264.

CHAP. X.

answered. Does the Spirit teach anything corresponding to the histories in the Bible? Penn's answer is, that it was the Spirit which taught Moses the history of Creation and of the Fall of man, 2000 years after the events. If it were necessary the same Spirit could still teach men in the same way. The facts of Christ's life were revealed to the prophets centuries before they happened. The same facts *might* be revealed now to those who have not the Scriptures. Penn did not say positively that they ever were, or that anything was revealed by the Spirit in addition to what we learn from the Scriptures.

Penn zealously advocated the principle which had been laid down by Bishop Croft and other liberal theologians, of always expressing doctrines in Scripture language. The theology of the schools was but opinions, the enforcement of which as conditions of communion had been, Penn said, the cause of all the troubles that century had witnessed in England. He wished all creeds to be reduced to the one article of Christian faith, that Jesus of Nazareth is the promised Messiah. That, he says, would be a happy day when all our animosities and vexations about matters of religion are buried in the one confession of Jesus the great Lord and Author of the Christian religion.* He quotes with approbation the words of John Hales, that it has been 'the common disease of Christians from the beginning, not to content themselves with that measure of faith which God and the Scriptures have expressly afforded us.' Whoever really receives this one article of faith that Jesus is the Messiah, will have embraced the substance of Christianity, and shall receive power to become one of the sons of God. What this means is explained in the sequel of this treatise.† A true Christian, one that has 'saving grace,' is one that has left off his sins and become an upright man. Penn did not receive the popular doctrine that there might be 'moral men in hell.' It was to the spirit of Christ that they owed their morality. This itself was the evidence that they were Christians, and for them to be lost was simply impossible. To the words of John Hales, 'The moral man is a Christian by the surer side,' Penn adds, 'Speculations

Creeds disparaged.

* Vol. iv. p. 91.

† An Address to Protestants.

may fail, notions be mistaken, forms wither, but faith and righteousness will stand the test.'*

Toleration advocated.

As a thorough Dissenter, and a member of the sect which had suffered most from persecution, Penn was in a position to form a correct estimate of what toleration ought to be. On merely religious grounds he maintained that it should be the same to all. As to government, there could be no plea of danger except from Roman Catholics, and they might be tolerated with the caution that they be prevented from persecuting others. The resurrection of the body is defended, but in the sense of St. Paul; a body will rise, but not the same body that is committed to the ground. On this and many other questions of theology, Penn agreed entirely with Locke. The arguments against the use of the sacraments, though in harmony with the general system of Quaker belief, seem to do most violence to the principle of following a simple and natural interpretation of the Scriptures.

Barclay's 'Apology.'

Barclay's 'Apology for the True Christian Divinity' is the standard authority for Quaker doctrine. It does not, perhaps, treat of any subject that has not been noticed by Penn, but it is more exhaustive. Penn's writings were only occasional, called forth by passing controversies. Barclay's 'Apology' is an elaborate exposition of the whole of the Quaker faith, and on some points the arguments are followed to their utmost limits. As a theological work it has great merits. Jewel may have had more learning, and Hooker more philosophy, but of all the representative advocates of religious parties, Barclay is least afraid of pursuing his arguments to their ultimate results, and of accepting what he believes with all the legitimate consequences.

The Quakers had no affection for Cromwell.

From the dedication of the 'Apology,' it appears that, though the Quakers had been cradled in the era of the Commonwealth, they had no affection for Cromwell. To them it had not been a time of liberty, for every man's hand had been against them. The restoration of the monarchy they regarded as the immediate work of God. Barclay tells King Charles, in words corresponding to those of Hickes and South, that it was 'the Lord's doing,' and

* Vol. iv. p. 115.

CHAP. X.

'marvellous in our eyes.' He adds, that 'it will justly be matter of wonder and astonishment to generations to come, and may sufficiently serve, if rightly observed, to confute and confound that Atheism wherewith this age doth so so much abound.' The rise of the Quakers and the restoration of King Charles were two things so closely connected that the separation of them seemed impossible. The 'long and dark night of apostasie' had ended. The Gospel was now again 'revealed.'*

In harmony with this spirit, Barclay testifies in a brief epistle to the reader, that what he has written has come from his heart rather than his head. It is what he has heard with the ears of his soul, seen with his inward eyes, and his hands have handled of the Word of Life. To the clergy of all kinds he wishes 'unfeigned repentance.'† God, he says, has laid aside the wise and learned, and chosen some 'despicable' instruments, like the fishermen of old, to proclaim the truth.

Their divine commission.

What is revelation?

From the instances of revelation in Scripture, Barclay tries to determine what revelation is. He defines it to be the immediate teaching of the Spirit. Sometimes it is internal, and sometimes it is by an outward voice. In every case it is God speaking, and reliance on His word is faith. This is shown from the instances of faith in the Epistle to

* The leaders in the time of the Commonwealth are described as full of oppression. They hated 'instruction which is the way of life,' and they 'evilly entreated the messengers of the Lord, and caused to beat and imprison His prophets, and persecuted His people.' But the Lord 'raised them up, and armed them with spiritual weapons, even with His own Spirit and power, whereby they testified in the streets and highways, and public markets and synagogues, against the pride, vanity, lusts and hypocrisy of that generation, who were righteous in their own eyes, though often cruelly entreated therefore. And they faithfully prophesied and foretold them of their judgment and downfall.' Barclay adds, that in later times, when persecution was hottest, unlike other Dissenters, they were never found 'creeping into holes and corners.' They were never overtaken in 'private conventicles,' but met openly in the public assemblies to testify for God and His truth.

† This is quite in harmony with the view the Quakers generally entertained of the teachers of religion who were not of their own sect. Penn describes the clergy as 'that cursed bitter stock of hirelings who have made drunk the nation, whilst they have cut their purses and picked their pockets.'—'Serious Apology,' as quoted by Leslie, p. 156. The Dissenting preachers he calls 'an ill-bred, pedantic crew, the bane of religion and pest of the world, the old incendiaries to mischief, and a pest to be shunned of mankind, against whom the boiling vengeance of an irritated God is ready to be poured out.'—'Quakerism no New Nickname,' as quoted by Leslie, p. 165.

the Hebrews. Some had the ministry of angels, some had external voices, and some dreams or visions. 'God said,' or 'The word of the Lord came unto me saying,' often meant nothing more than the Spirit of God speaking in the heart. Faith in every case has the same object, and revelation, or inspiration, is the same now that it has ever been. The Socinians, according to Barclay, denied the work of the Spirit altogether, and wished to be guided only by Scripture interpreted by reason. Others, again, admitted the subjective, but denied the objective teaching of the Spirit. They allowed a spiritual influence on the minds of men, enabling them to understand the Scriptures, but they did not allow that any distinct or definite truth was presented to the mind. To prove this 'objective' teaching was Barclay's great object. He argued from the universality of the promise 'The Spirit shall teach you all things.' It is not said that the Spirit will enable them to understand what is written, but that all things shall be brought to their remembrance. This is found to correspond to the nature of the new covenant, as it is described by the old prophets. In Isaiah God promises His Spirit, saying that the words which He put into the mouth of the people shall not depart from them. This is expressed more fully in Jeremiah, and repeated in the Epistle to the Hebrews, where God says concerning the new covenant, 'I will put my laws into their minds, and write them in their hearts.' Augustine and Aquinas both explain the new law as different from the old. It is not a law written without, but written within, on the table of the heart. The object of faith, or revelation, is therefore inward, immediate, and objective.

Revelation universal,

The answer really required to settle the question was to point out definitely what the Spirit now teaches in this 'objective' way. All men, heathen and Jews as well as Christians, are said to be led by the Spirit. Are they all taught the same things? The answer is that they are; but that some have more lessons, and others are more facile in learning. This makes faith and salvation possible to all men, whatever may be their knowledge derived from external sources. Those whom Barclay addressed had an idea of revelation, or inspiration, which the Quakers seem

CHAP. X.

to have abandoned. They supposed an 'absolute' certain as to particular revelations, and in the Church, or the Bibl they supposed an embodiment of the entire teaching of th Spirit. But Barclay clearly denies that we can say of an particular person, or people, that they are infallibly led b the Spirit. The revelation he admits to be certain an infallible, but we cannot show where it is made certainly an infallibly. The light is perfect, but the mediums imperfec The light has never deceived, but darkness has often pre tended to be light. The Spirit is a sure guide, but ther are false spirits. To those who object this uncertainty Bar clay can only answer, that they render all faith uncertain The same difficulty accompanies tradition, Scripture, an reason. We are in the position of learners, and can onl have a conviction, or inward assurance, that the teacher i right.

and not limited to the Bible.

This was simply transferring to the Spirit what Protestant generally had ascribed to the Scriptures, who, as Barcla shows, really rested on the Spirit for their faith in the Bible Calvin's words are quoted, that 'he only whom the Hol Ghost hath persuaded can repose himself on the Scriptur with a true certainty.' To the same effect are the words c the French and Dutch Confessions with that of Westminste The Spirit is first and the Scriptures follow. Barclay sup poses that it is on the authority of the Spirit that we nov receive the books in the Bible, and no others, for canonical We should have expected that the same Spirit would hav testified to the right copies and the best translations. Bu instead of this, Barclay argues from the uncertainty of a mer writing to the necessity of receiving the Spirit only, as the firs teacher and primary rule of faith. 'We may safely conclude,' he says, 'that Jesus Christ, who promised to be always with His children, to lead them into all truth, to guard them against the devices of the enemy, and to establish their feet upon an immovable rock, left them not to be principally ruled by that which was subject in itself to many uncertainties, and therefore He gave them His Spirit as their principal guide, which neither moths nor time can wear out, nor tran- scribers nor translators corrupt; which none are so young, none so illiterate, none so remote in place, but they may

come to be reached, and rightly informed by it.'* Barclay, however, denies that we can receive any new gospel, or new doctrines, so that the 'objective' teaching of the Spirit comes in the end to be limited to that which is already taught.

Quakers orthodox.

The dogmatic teaching of the Quakers is found, therefore, to be, in the main, the same as that of the orthodox sects. It is professedly derived from Scripture, or at least, it is supposed to agree with Scripture, even when presented 'objectively' by the Spirit. The death which followed on Adam's transgression Barclay explains as death spiritual. Adam's guilt, he says, is not ascribed to his posterity until they make it their own by similar acts of disobedience. Yet, as Adam had nothing good in his nature, they could not derive anything good from him. The 'seed of God,' or the light of Christ, is something superinduced on mere nature. This privation of good in the natural man is in reality evil, as understood by Barclay. He applies to all the posterity of Adam the words in Genesis, that the imagination of man's heart is evil continually; and the words of Jeremiah, that the heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked. When St. Paul says of the heathen, that they do by nature the things contained in the law, this 'nature' is explained as the new nature. By Adam's transgression a seed of sin is transmitted to all men, but his sin itself is imputed to none. Redemption is the counterpart of this corruption. The light enlightens every man that comes into the world. It is not absolutely necessary to salvation that they hear the outward preaching of the Gospel. Christ died not to procure a righteousness to be imputed to others, but to eradicate the actual evil that is in the world. In the sinner Christ is crucified by our sins, but in the righteous man He has risen to life, and triumphed over all His enemies. The light within is opposed to the natural man. It is also to be distinguished from the rational man. When reason takes the place of this spiritual principle, it is Antichrist setting himself in the temple of God. Reason has its office in things natural, but the Spirit rules in the spiritual. Barclay also distinguishes this light from the light of conscience. He defines conscience as arising from the natural faculties

* P. 82.

CHAP. X.

of man's soul. It may be defiled or corrupted, it follow the judgment, but 'this light, as it is received, removes th blindness of the judgment, opens the understanding, an rectifies both the judgment and the conscience.'* The ligh of Christ is the candle, but conscience is only the lantern i which it shines. Justification is explained as the inward birth, and the fruits following it. By grace man is enable to keep the commandments of God. The Church consists o all who are thus justified, whether they be called Christians or Pagans.

George Keith answers Penn and Barclay.

Penn and Barclay were both answered by George Keith, their former friend and colleague. Keith, after being an apostle of Quakerism, was perverted to the Church of England. He denies that he had ever received Quaker doctrines as they were understood by Barclay and Penn. The title of his book, 'The Deism of William Penn and his Brethren,' expresses his judgment of Quaker theology. This book was an answer to Penn's treatise on the rule of faith, and the judge of controversy. Keith noticed in the preface an obvious contradiction between Quaker doctrine and Quaker practice. The Church was said to consist of all who followed the light within, whether Jews, Turks, Pagans, or Christians. The practice consistent with this belief would have been fellowship and communion with all good men. But the Quakers were exclusive beyond all other sects. They called themselves 'the chosen people,' and were not content to absent themselves quietly from the meetings of other Christians, but they were even 'moved by the Spirit' to call all Christian preachers deceivers except their own, and to cry aloud against the idolatry of every sect in the nation. Keith says, 'They Christianize the heathen and heathenize the Christians.' Their doctrine of immediate inspiration was allied to an enthusiastic piety, and yet, as Keith said, in some respects it approaches simple Deism.

Keith's 'Retractations.'

Keith had already published a volume of 'Explications and Retractations.' He there confessed that he had been in error, but never, he said, in such error as he found in the writings of William Penn. He had confounded the rule of faith with the medium of faith, the things to be believed

* P. 147.

with the medium of credibility. The Bible contains the *credenda*, but the Spirit's testimony is the inward evidence. This he had meant and this he still maintained. What he opposed was the belief that the Spirit's witness was merely effective and not 'objective.' For this he claimed the sanction of many Protestant divines. But Penn's error was in making the Spirit a higher rule than the Scriptures. The Spirit, Keith says, was not a rule at all, but the moving cause of faith, that by which we believe the Scriptures. He had never taught that men might be saved without believing in Christ crucified, in the remission of sins by His blood, and 'other doctrinal principles of Christianity.' He had never taught that the light in every man's conscience, or the dictates of it, apart from the peculiar doctrines of Christianity, are the rule of faith. This, he says, is plain Deism. This is the error of William Penn. 'By general rule,' Penn says, 'we understand that constant measure by which men in all ages have been enabled to judge of the truth or error of doctrines, and the good or evil of thoughts, words, or actions.' Keith answers, that this is a definition of something which does not exist. There may be such a general rule of morality, but not of matters of faith. The law written in the heart may bear witness of the distinctions between right and wrong, but it tells us nothing of the blood of Christ, of the Lamb that taketh away the sins of the world. Penn's definition of faith corresponds to his definition of the rule of faith. It is such a faith as no one ever had without faith in Christ as the God-man. Some of the Pagans may have had a kind of faith or hope in God, but this is not the faith of God's elect, which can only rest on special revelation. Faith as defined by Penn may be the faith of a Deist or a Pagan.

Light within not the rule of faith.

The light within, according to Keith, cannot be the rule of faith, because it does not dictate the things necessary to be believed for salvation. These are laid down in the Scriptures, and without the Scriptures they cannot be known. It is not the sun which indicates the time, but the sun-dial. Men may know much of God by the contemplation of His works, but it is only by special revelation that they can know the fundamental doctrines of the Christian

CHAP. X.

religion. Penn's principle, that inspiration in the prese day is the same in kind as the inspiration of prophets a apostles, is to Keith a convincing proof of the Deism of t Quakers.

The Quakers and Deism.

In the answer to Barclay, Keith finds the same indic tions of simple Deism. The knowledge of God is suppose to be sufficient for salvation, without the knowledge Christ incarnate and crucified for the sins of men; and th knowledge is supposed to be given directly by the Spiri without the use of the Scriptures. Barclay had made man quotations from the Reformers and divines of the Church England concerning the necessity of the teaching of th Spirit. Keith shows that in all these quotations the writer assumed the existence of the external word and doctrine a a secondary means. The quotations do not bear the sens of immediate inspiration as it is understood by the Quakers Barclay had said expressly that the essence of the Christia religion did not consist in the historical knowledge of th birth, life, and death of Jesus. This knowledge might b an external part, but Christianity was independent of it There was, of course, the provision that the Spirit migh teach directly the histories and doctrines of the Gospel yet there was no evidence that this was done now withou the Scriptures. George Fox had indeed said that withou the Scripture the Spirit had taught men that Christ die for sin; but this 'he had presumed to affirm most ignorantly and presumptuously.' If, then, men are saved without the knowledge of the Scriptures, they are saved without the knowledge of Christ, and thus Deists and Pagans are in the same condition as Christians.*

* The pamphlet literature of apostate Quakers is very plentiful. The sect claimed to be the people chosen in the latter day; and, though protesting against the order or necessary government of other communities, it was itself compelled to establish order. This government, in the judgment of the apostates, was not better than the government of other churches. The author of a curious tract called 'The Spirit of the Hat,' who had been a Quaker, but who was excommunicated for refusing to take off his hat during prayer, found the community governed by George Fox and his friends, as the Pope and the Cardinals governed at Rome. They allowed liberty to none within the body, but required all to believe as the Church believed, and to do as the Church prescribed, even to the times and seasons for putting on or pulling off the hat. Another apostate showed that the once pious Quaker ministers had become 'buyers of corn to sell again, and managers of great brewhouses' ('A Testimony against the

Charles Leslie against the Quakers.

The best-known writer against the Quakers on the Church side was Charles Leslie. He hated them as wild enthusiasts, whose principles were simply those of the Deists. Under pretence of a new revelation they overthrew the authority both of the Church and the Scriptures. Leslie called his treatise 'The Snake in the Grass,' which meant in Scripture language 'the devil clothed as an angel of light.' In the year 1650 'the great adversary inspired George Fox and Lodowick Muggleton, persuading them that they were inspired by the Spirit of God.' In Leslie's theology, Christianity stood or fell with the bishops and clergy; to leave the priesthood and the ordinances was to make shipwreck of faith, and to float in the shoreless sea of Atheism or Deism. It was wholly, he said, for the love of souls that he entered on the controversy with the Quakers. At one time he had thought them the most ignorant and contemptible sect of Dissenters; but, after reading their books, he found them the most subtle of all, inheriting not only the heresy, but the hypocrisy of the Arians and Socinians.

Their blasphemy.

In Leslie's judgment, the later Quakers had laid aside the madness and blasphemy of George Fox and the first preachers. They did not own this, as they were unwilling to admit a change in the principles of the sect. Penn, he says, refined their blasphemous pretences, and dressed them up with more craft, and consequently with more wickedness. George Fox says that 'the soul is a part of God, for it came out of Him; and that which came out of Him is of Him.' He says that it is equal to God, and infinite. Penn's explanation is that Fox, being an illiterate man, did not use his words definitely. By equality he meant unity, and by 'infinite,' something which does not end. Leslie finds in Fox's writings, that he said expressly that he was Christ, and equal to God; that he professed immediate revelations,

Quakers' False Doctrine, by Geoffrey Bullock,' p. 19), and yet had established themselves as judges of the saints. A third apostate, who had been censured for refusing to marry a Quaker widow recommended by her near kinsman, made some strange revelations ('The Quakers' Spiritual Court Proclaimed,' by Nathaniel Smith, Student of Physic). He had been condemned by George Fox for saying that the earth was round, and that when it was day with us it was night in other places. Fox told him that he knew, by revelation of the Spirit, that the earth was not round, and that when it was twelve o'clock with us, it was twelve o'clock all over the world.

CHAP. X.

the same in kind as are supposed to have been given to prophets and apostles; that in 1653 he foretold that day of judgment would take place in November that y The first Quakers, according to Leslie, believed themse inspired as individuals by an infallible Spirit; but doctrine was renounced when the sect was formed in society with government. The infallibility was then tr ferred to the body, and the rulers pronounced judgmen apostates. When George Keith expounded a passage Scripture in a different sense to that in which Penn und stood it, Penn solemnly, in the name of the Lord, nounced Keith an apostate. Leslie finds the Quak heretical on all the authorized dogmas of Christianity, even the quaking of their bodies, from which they de their name, he found to be one of the works of the de who agitates their bodies as well as their souls. They were not only 'perfect Deists,' but 'the most monstrous sort of Deists that ever were in the world; for they hold with the Ranters, from whom they sprang, that there is no difference or distinction betwixt God and creatures, but that everything is God, even the devil.' * †

The Baptists.

The Baptists, like the Church of England, had divided into the two parties of Calvinists and Arminians. A few years later some of them rejected the doctrine of the Trinity. But the question which separated them hopelessly from the Church of England was the denial of infant baptism. The first Baptists attached great importance to external ordinances. The observance of a ceremony was to them, as to the majority of High Churchmen, of equal moment with keeping a precept of the moral law. Like the Nonjurors, they were in their own way a 'peculiar people.' The more they were separated, and the smaller their number, the greater the evidence that they were 'the chosen.'

The chief Baptist writer of this period was John Bunyan, whose works represent the best and the worst features of Puritan theology. Like many deeply pious men, Bunyan preferred the dim religious light of mystery to the clear

* Vol. ix. p. 12.

† The 'Snake in the Grass' was answered by Geo. Whitehead. Leslie vindicated his treatise by a 'Defence of the Snake,' in answer to the 'Switch,' and by 'Satan Disrobed from his Disguise of Light.'

clusions of reason. He embraced the theological system of Calvin in its extremest form, and he accepted all the doctrines concerning the Scriptures, redemption, heaven, and hell, that were then received by the religious world. The rational principles of the Quakers were repulsive to the soul of Bunyan. He thanks God devoutly that he was delivered from their 'vile and abominable' errors. The difference between the Quaker, as represented by William Penn, and the Baptist, as represented by John Bunyan, covers the whole distance between the rational and the 'orthodox' Christian. The Quaker said that the Scriptures were not the word of God, and Bunyan gave as his first reason for refusing to use the 'Book of Common Prayer,' that it was not prescribed in the Scriptures.

His terrible theology.

The terribleness of Bunyan's theology might be ascribed partly to his vivid imagination, and partly to an awful earnestness of the inward man. His mind was one of those which receive impressions deeply, and reflect but too faithfully the external influence. To Bunyan hell was literally a lake of fire, where God Himself would 'pile up wrath' upon the sinner, and 'blow the fire.'* To this the divine Being was impelled by justice, which seems to be some power of fate external to God, for children being wicked vipers even in the womb, the holiness of God is offended until justice is executed.† To deliver the elect from the punishment of the sins in which they are born Christ bore the wrath of God. He fulfilled the law for them, and with His righteousness they are covered.‡ But those who are not saved shall suffer in this fire. 'Their bodies will be raised from the dead as vessels for the soul—vessels of wrath. The soul will breathe hell-fire and smoke, and coals will seem to hang upon its burning lips, yea, the face, eyes and ears will seem to be chimneys and vents for the flame and the smoke of the burning, which God by His breath hath kindled therein, and upon them, which will be held one in another, to the great torment and distress of each other.'§ This, to some, may seem imagination, but

* Works, p. 120. The edition referred to is that of George Offor. This is the most correct edition, though sadly marred by the editor's unfortunate notes.
† Page 127.
‡ Page 131.
§ Page 136.

CHAP. X.

to Bunyan it was probably reality. It agreed with Puritan principle of taking the Scriptures as the word God without reference to an inner word, which was to determine the sense of the Scriptures.

His too literal interpretations of Scripture.

In the same way Bunyan finds that Christ execut many offices. These were all taken literally. One, he thought, had been specially neglected. This was the office of advocate. The words of Job concerning one that would plead for him are applied to Christ. But the sense of Job is forgotten. He longed for one to vindicate his cause, to establish his innocency, and to reason with God concerning sufferings which he had not deserved to bear. I Bunyan's sense of advocate is one that takes a bad case, and makes satisfaction for the shortcomings of the client. The advocate is even to pay the client's debts, that he may go free. It is not because men are righteous, but because they are sinners, that a daysman is required. This is Bunyan's theology; and so far as words go, it has the sanction of St. John. 'If any man sin we have an advocate.' The worse the case the more likely it is to succeed. Christ having paid the debt He can now maintain our cause against the devil. According to Bunyan the advocate not only pays the debt and refuses all good cases, but he also becomes the judge. The incompatibility of all these offices in one person naturally suggested that they were only ascribed to Christ in the way of figures. But Bunyan answered that in heaven it was thought possible and necessary that Christ should hold them all. He does not, like other advocates, receive a fee, for He undertakes our cause as that of those who are unable to pay.

Incongruities of his theology.

To this following of the letter may be traced many evident incongruities in Bunyan's theology. Scripture phrases which apparently contradict each other are taken literally, and so the contradiction is made real. Election to eternal life 'before the foundation of the world' is said to be the act of the Father not of the Son. This is an evidence of the grace of the Father,* and yet the blood of Christ is spoken of as 'prevailing with a God of grace to give mercy and grace' to undeserving man.† In virtue of this election

* P. 344. † P. 651.

men are saved before they are called, and yet Bunyan represents God addressing sinners in the words in which Bonner used to address Protestants, saying, 'Turn or burn.' From St. Paul's words that Christ was made sin and a curse for us, Bunyan concludes that Christ was imputed wicked, and was punished as a sinner. He was 'justly hanged, because sin worthy of death was upon Him.'*

His controversial writings.

Bunyan's controversial writings are not numerous. The greatest enemies to Christianity that he could find were the Quakers, and such writers as Dr. Fowler, who denied the whole theological scheme of justification by the righteousness of another. The 'errors' of the Quakers, whom he identified with the old Ranters, are refuted in many places in Bunyan's writings. Their doctrine of the resurrection was to him the denial of the resurrection of the body. Their light within was but the subtlety of the devil, who sometimes appears as an angel of light. By the light within the devil makes Baal's priests cut themselves with knives, and persuades Quakers to give heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils, even to forbear wearing 'hat-bands.' When their spirit moves them, Bunyan says, 'they will speak such sad blasphemies and vent such horrible doctrines, that it makes me wonder to see the patience of God, in that He doth not command either the ground to open her mouth and swallow them up, or else suffer the devil to fetch them away alive, to the astonishment of the whole world.† They are again described as the 'false Christs and false prophets' that were to come in the latter days, whose consciences are seared with a hot iron, who deceive the very elect, and are themselves sealed for destruction.‡ It might be pleaded for Bunyan that he misunderstood the Quakers, or that he had only met some of the more extravagant members of the sect. But from Bunyan's standpoint the theology of the most judicious of the Quakers could have been nothing else but a perversion of Christianity. They believed in salvation without the necessity of a substitute for sin, and in justification without an external righteousness. They laid aside the scheme which to Bunyan was the Gospel. They might differ in some little things from

* Vol. i. p. 409. † Vol. ii. p. 153. ‡ P. 163.

CHAP. X.

the Ranters, as a dog differs from a wolf, but they 'h agree to worry Christ's lambs.'*

His answer to Dr. Fowler's 'Design of Christianity.'

The theology of Dr. Fowler's 'Design of Christianit was the same in substance with that of the Quakers. Bun heard of this book when in Bedford prison, and wrote elaborate answer to it, which he called 'A Defence of t Doctrine of Justification.' Fowler as a Platonist had forth the principles of eternal morality, and interpret Christianity as a means of restoring man to the original r titude in which he was created. The moral duties w binding on men by natural laws, and the positive duties w enjoined as things indifferent in themselves, considered a solutely, but not indifferent when viewed in reference to t object to be attained. The three positive duties whi Fowler found in Christianity were, coming to God by Chri and the observance of the two sacraments. Fowler's mea... ing from the stand-point of philosophy was lost to Bunya That coming to God by Christ could be in any sense a thi indifferent, was to him a blasphemy not to be borne. Fow found among some Pagans the moral excellence which ... was the design of Christianity to promote. The Quak had done the same, even including in the idea of the Chur the virtuous men of all countries, all ages, and all cree Many had come to God who had never heard the name o Christ. Bunyan saw the agreement of Fowler with the Quakers. They both exalted natural goodness to equal it with that holiness which is not of the world nor of the crea- ture. A difference, however, was noticed between Fowler and the Quakers. Fowler made this excellence natural to man. It was, so to speak, his original nature, and the object of Christianity was its restoration. The Quakers, on the other hand, called it Christ within, or the light of Christ. They made all natural goodness the light of Christ, while Fowler called it natural goodness, or the original rectitude in which men were created. To Bunyan they were alike wrong. They both meant the same thing, under different names. Adam, Bunyan says, was a pure natural man. He consisted of body and soul. 'That was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural, and afterwards that which is spiritual.'

* P. 182.

Through Christ we come into possession of a holiness unknown to Adam in Paradise, a holiness which is superinduced, and not originally natural to man. Hierocles, as quoted by Fowler, said that nothing was really evil but sin, and consequently the avoidance of sin was the righteousness of man. Bunyan called this the design of the devil to lead men away from the righteousness of the new covenant. The restoration of man could only be effected by the death of Christ. Without satisfaction for sin, 'the eternal justice of God could not consent to the salvation of the sinner.'* Fowler, indeed, spoke of Christ's death in the most orthodox language, as an expiatory or propitiatory sacrifice. But he added that it was effectual only for them that believe. To Bunyan this was a denial of the efficacy of the atonement; for if satisfaction was made to God, and yet salvation left to depend on man's believing, then it was due not to the work of Christ, but to human faith.

On reprobation.

Bunyan embraced the Calvinistic theology in its completeness. He did not shrink from any legitimate conclusion which followed any of its parts. Reprobation was not evaded as something not necessarily involved in predestination. The one was the counterpart of the other, and each was equally true. An old writer says that there is a book of death, in which 'the names of the reprobates are registered for destruction.'† Bunyan does not use the same words, but he taught what the words mean. He reasoned justly, that if some men were elected, the others must be rejected. If only the predestinate are saved, the others must be reprobate. They are under the negative of election, which is reprobation. This does not mean, Bunyan says, that God absolutely hates them or curses them. He only leaves them to the awful suffering which He has appointed for sin. God may give them 'the gift of Christ, of faith, of hope, and many other benefits.' He only 'denies them that benefit that will infallibly bring them to eternal life.'‡ They are reprobated, that God may show His wrath, and make His power known. Their being rejected, had no regard to their sin. It is 'most true,' Bunyan says, that

* P. 294.

† 'Stop to the Gangrene of Arminianism,' by R. Resburie, 1651.

‡ P. 338.

CHAP. X.

'sin is no cause of eternal reprobation, yet seeing sin h seized on the reprobate, it cannot be but thereby the dec must needs be the faster fixed.'*

On the Sabbath.

The rigid literalism of the early and extreme Purita found its last shelter in the Baptist sect. In the history the Sabbath controversy, in the time of Charles I., the Puritan argument ended legitimately in the observance of the seventh day as the proper fulfilment of the Divine law. Samuel Brabourne's 'Seventh-day Sabbath-keepers' were now found only among the Baptists.† In his treatise again these Sabbatarians, Bunyan first shows his capacity for the free use of reason in a purely religious question. He denies that any Sabbath, or seventh day, was binding on man from Adam to Moses. We read, he says, that Abel, Noah, Abraham, and the patriarchs worshipped and sacrificed, but nowhere find that they observed the seventh day as a day of rest and worship. This was purely a Jewish institution. Nehemiah says that God made known to the Israelites by the hand of Moses His holy Sabbath. The punishment due to the Sabbath-breakers was not known till it was declared by Moses, which is regarded as an evident proof that t commandment itself did not exist. When Jesus declared to the young man what commandments were necessary eternal life, He omitted the law of the Sabbath. Fr many passages of Scripture Bunyan argues that the seven day was not a moral law, but a Jewish institutio having no relation to the Gentiles. It was accompanied with rites and ceremonies, which were essential to its proper observance, and these were known only to the Jews. But the necessity of worship requires a time to be fixed for it. So that the principle is moral, though the ordinance of one particular day is merely positive. The Son of Man was Lord of the Sabbath Day. In setting aside the dispensation of Moses, He abrogated the Jewish Sabbath. He gave a new day, the first day of the week, which is the Sabbath of the Christians, or the churches of the Gentiles.

Bunyan's treatise on the Sabbath must have been great service in correcting the extreme Sabbatarianism

* P. 342.

† One congregation of this sect still exists in the East End of London.

the Baptists of that day. But he did a far greater work than even this for the narrow sect. Before his time open communion was scarcely known among the Baptist congregations. Robert Hall says that Bunyan was the first 'to break the yoke,' and was regarded as a rebel, or insurgent, against legitimate authority. The difference, apparently, lay on the surface; but in reality it was very deep, so deep as almost entirely to separate Bunyan in principle from the Baptist sect. The little flock of the immersed regarded themselves alone as within the Christian fold. To the Baptist those baptized in infancy were as much outside the Christian covenant as the sectary to the High Churchman. Alike to the Baptist and the extreme Churchman, the outward ordinance of baptism was the only gate into the sheepfold; and to the former that was not baptism which was performed by sprinkling, or administered to children. Bunyan altogether denied that baptism in any sense was the initiatory ordinance of the Christian Church.* The first believers were baptized on their professing faith; but it is never said that this baptism made them members of the Church. Mere outward baptism did not confer that privilege, and the want of mere outward baptism cannot take it away. The rule by which the visible Church is to be guided in receiving its members is the Christian life of those who wish to be reckoned Christians. It was not to depend on anything merely circumstantial, but on the reality of faith and works. St. Paul wrote to the Corinthians not to keep company with fornicators, idolaters, or drunkards. He does not say that they were not to communicate with those who had not been baptized with water, or who had not received the 'laying on of hands.' These notions Bunyan calls 'fictions,' and 'Scriptureless.'† But even if baptism were the initiatory ordinance, it would be wrong to refuse Christian fellowship with men who were really Christian in their lives. Moses and Joshua communicated with six thousand uncircumcised Israelites in the wilderness, though circumcision was required as a condition of visible Church communion.

On close communion.

In the course of this argument Bunyan proves that bap-

Baptism indifferent.

* Vol. ii. p. 605.

† P. 607.

CHAP. X.

tism is altogether a thing indifferent, and much more certain mode of its administration adopted by Baptis Many thousands, he says, who have never been baptized immersion, 'have more gloriously than we are like to c acquitted themselves and their Christianity before men, a are now with the innumerable company of angels, and t spirits of just men made perfect.'*

The Baptists who replied to Bunyan† said that the Epi tles in the New Testament were not addressed to t unbaptized, and the inference was made that the Scri tures belonged only to those who had been immerse They regarded the 'sprinkled' Independents with who Bunyan associated, as mere Pagans, saying that 'the ought to be ashamed and repent' of their infant ba tism, 'before they be showed the pattern of the hous Bunyan answered that he did not despise baptism ev as administered by the Baptists. But there were thos who had that which baptism signified, which was of mor importance than baptism itself. A true believer, thoug not baptized with water, has the doctrine of baptism.

Not necessary to make a Christian.

Bunyan's opponents had recourse to the old Puritan argu ment, afterwards appropriated by High Churchmen, tha as God took so much care in ceremonies among the Jew much more would He under the better dispensation. Moses were faithful over his house, much more was Chris 'Was God so exact,' the Baptists said, 'with His peopl then, that all things to a pin must be according to the pat tern in the mount, whose worship then, comparatively t the Gospel, was but after the law of a carnal commandment and can it be supposed that He should be so indifferent now, and leave men to their own liberty?' Bunyan an swers, 'As for the pins and tacks of the tabernacle, they were expressly commanded, and when you have proved by the word of God that you ought to shut saints out of your communion for want of baptism, then you may begin more justly to make your parallel.'§ It is nowhere said that the

* P. 611.

† 'Some Serious Reflections on that part of Mr. Bunyan's Confession of Faith Touching Church Communion with Unbaptized Believers,' by W. K. It is said to have been the joint work of H. D'Anvers, T. Paul, and W. Kiffin. There is no copy of this tract in any London library.

‡ P. 627.

§ P. 636.

unbaptized believer is to be excluded from Church communion, nor is it said that Jesus, St. Paul, or the Ethiopian eunuch by their baptism, became members of the Church. 'It rests with you,' Bunyan says to his opponents, 'to prove that baptism is the fruit of faith, or that faith ought to be tied to take its first step in water baptism.'* 'It is,' they answered 'the livery of a Christian.' Bunyan told them to go but ten doors from home, and see how many would be known by this livery that they had put on Christ. 'What! known by water baptism to be one that hath put on Christ, as a gentleman's man is known to be his master's servant by the gay garment his master gave him. Away, fond man, you quite forget the text. By *this* shall men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love *one to another*.'† Bunyan adds, 'I am not against every man, though by your abusive language you would set every one against me, but I am for union, concord, and communion with saints as saints, and for that cause I wrote my book.'

Union of Presbyterians and Independents.

In 1691, the Presbyterians and Independents were united into one body. It was a mere fellowship of brothers in adversity, for the varieties of opinion were the same among the Nonconformists as in the Church of England. Matthew Mead, pastor of an Independent congregation in Stepney, preached the union sermon, from the text in Ezekiel which he made famous, concerning the 'two sticks' that were made one. The 'wolf,' he said, was now to dwell with the lamb, and he hoped the silence would not be like the silence in heaven, which continued only for half an hour. The Independents, who were more exclusive than the Presbyterians, were never heartily satisfied with this union. It was disturbed, before a year had passed, first, by some irregular preaching, of which the Presbyterians did not approve, and then by the great Antinomian controversy. The Independents kept rigidly to Calvinism, and took the Antinomian side in the controversy which followed the republication of the works of Dr. Crisp.‡ In 1694 the Presbyterians were excluded from the Merchants' Lecture at Pinners' Hall, and before the end of the century the union was virtually dis-

* P. 637.
† P. 638.
‡ See Vol. I. of the present work, p. 258.

CHAP. X.

solved. The Antinomian controversy was finally settled a mutual appeal from both parties to the arbitration of Stingfleet and Jonathan Edwards.

Occasional conformity.

The Act of Toleration brought freedom to the dissenter but the Test Act remained. No man could hold office who did not communicate with the Established Church. The object of this law had been to exclude Roman Catholics from offices of State. Only a small number of Protestant Nonconformists had scruples about conformity to the extent of occasional communion. One of the first acts of the ejected ministers in London, in 1662, was to pass a resolution that they would continue to receive the sacraments at their parish churches. This practice was mainly continued by the Presbyterians. Their sincerity was not to be questioned. They wished to be considered members of the Church of England. It was then reckoned no paradox, no contradiction, to be a Nonconformist, and yet a member of the Church of England.

The Lord Mayor at Pinners' Hall.

In 1697, Sir Humphrey Edwin, after receiving the Sacrament at church, went to worship at Pinners' Hall, with the sword of office carried before him. Rigid Churchmen were offended that he had gone in state to the meeting house, and some Nonconformists that he had gone to church to qualify himself, as they said, for holding office. It was not necessary to suppose that the Lord Mayor was insincere, and it was only by extreme Nonconformists that he was condemned. Daniel De Foe, who seems to have been the first political Dissenter, assailed the Lord Mayor in an anonymous pamphlet called an 'Enquiry into Occasional Conformity among the Dissenters.' The argument was the easy one, that if the Church is right, the meeting is wrong, and conversely, if the meeting is right, the Church is wrong. There is, he says, a sort of truth, 'a something which all men owe to the principles they profess, and, generally speaking, all men pay it.' A Turk is a Turk, and an idolater is an idolater. It is only Protestants who 'are amphibious, and try to serve God and Baal.' They can believe one way of worship to be right, and yet they can serve God in another way. To be of two religions is a contradiction. De Foe manages his argument in that incisive form too frequent in religious controversies, which assumes premises not granted by the oppo-

nent. Every man, he says, ought to conform to the Established Church, unless he feels dissent a matter of conscience, and is more willing to die than to conform. This alternative is founded on the magnitude of the sin of schism. It is said to be the sin which every man ought to avoid, but if he is compelled by conscience to separate, then the guilt rests with those who cause the separation. But to dissent and yet to conform, is to deny the lawfulness of dissent. Either occasional conformity is a sin, or dissent is a sin. Men cannot maintain their principles and subvert them at the same time. For a man to take the Sacraments at church that he may hold the office of Lord Mayor of London, is called a scandal to the chief magistracy, a profanation of God's ordinance, and a bantering with religion.

De Foe on occasional conformity.

In 1701, Sir Thomas Abney, another dissenter, was elected Lord Mayor, and received the Sacrament at St. Paul's. He was a member of the congregation of which John Howe was pastor, and continued to worship as a Dissenter during the year of his mayoralty. De Foe's wrath became more impetuous. He republished his pamphlet, with a preface addressed to Howe, calling upon him to condemn the practice of occasional conformity, and vindicate the purity of dissent. Howe had always been a moderate, yet a decided Nonconformist. He was willing to conform in 1662, but as he had been ordained by a presbytery, he refused to be re-ordained. He had no wish to perpetuate dissent for its own sake. He was unwilling to be silent, but he wished to continue a communicant in the Church of England. Addressed to a man in Howe's position, De Foe's arguments had no meaning. Howe immediately defended himself in 'Some Considerations on the Preface of the Enquiry.' He had satisfied his own conscience, and he found it, he said, a much easier matter to please God than to please men. He pointed out the distinction, overlooked by De Foe, between a Church essentially defective, and a Church defective only in some 'accidentals.' There was a division in the Apostolic Church about meats and drinks, but St. Paul's advice was not separation. He gave two rules, one for the persons who had scruples, that they be fully persuaded in their own minds, and another for the rulers of the Church,—'him that is weak

Answered by John Howe.

CHAP. X.

in the faith receive.' Who art thou, Howe asks triumphantly, that judgest thy brother? The Lord Mayor has acted according to his own conscience, and not according to that of Daniel De Foe. Howe is compelled to become the apologist of the Church of England. He says that he has known some of the holiest saints who have found their highest elevation in the use of the Book of Common Prayer. De Foe's question 'for God or Baal?' could not, he says, have been meant seriously, it must have been intended for a piece of wit. He added, that it was impious and profane to speak of the Church and the meeting as two different religions. He reminded De Foe of the original resolution of the ejected ministers, not to leave the Communion of the Established Church. It was a matter which must rest with the individual conscience, and in which one man must not judge another. De Foe replied, in 'A Letter to Mr. Howe.' He had two objects in writing his 'Enquiry.' One was to see if he could evoke any arguments sufficient to convince him that occasional conformity was right, and the other was to explode, and, as far as in him lay, to oppose the practice. Howe had boasted that such had been his moderation that he had never persuaded any one to Nonconformity. De Foe thought this was something of which one who was pastor of a Dissenting Church, administering the ordinances to a 'select people,' ought not to be proud. 'Verily,' he says, if I were advanced to that coldness, I would conform immediately.'

In 1702 De Foe published two other pamphlets bearing on the subject. One is the famous piece of irony called 'The Shortest Way with the Dissenters.' The argument is that if Dissenters care so little about Dissent, the best way to put them down is by persecution. If their Nonconformity regards only 'a few modes or accidents,' it is certain that they will not die for it. Many of the Nonconformists of that day still maintained that they were members of the Church of England. They refused to conform in some things, but they conformed in others. They even said that while the State gave them toleration that made them part of the State Church. De Foe treated this argument with ridicule. Every Dissenting congregation, he said, had

'The Shortest Way with the Dissenters.'

always been dissatisfied with 'conforming Nonconformity.' The other pamphlet had the title of 'An Enquiry into Occasional Conformity, showing that the Dissenters are in no way concerned in it.' It was proposed by a Bill in Parliament to prevent occasional conformity. This appeared to some to be depriving the Dissenters of privileges which they had long possessed. On this ground the Bill was opposed by moderate men of all parties. De Foe's object was to prove that it was no injustice to Dissenters. It was no prelude to the repeal of toleration. The Queen had declared herself decidedly for the Church of England, and this had encouraged the 'hot men' on the Church side, but there was every reason to believe that the utmost justice would be done to Dissenters. 'The pulpit,' De Foe says, 'that *drum ecclesiastic*, began the war, and Mr. Sacheverell in his sermon at Oxford doomed the Dissenters to destruction without either bell, book, or candle.' But the Bill to prohibit occasional conformity was not, he maintained, intended for any interference with the rights of Nonconformists.

Sacheverell and Leslie against occasional conformity.

Sacheverell was in favour of the Bill, but on different grounds from De Foe. He wished the prohibition of occasional conformity that the Nonconformists might be entirely excluded from all civil or municipal offices. The English monarchy, he said, depended on the Church. It was therefore the duty of the Crown to support the Church and suppress Dissent. The 'occasional conformists' were 'faithless men.' By 'hypocrisy, craft, and insidiousness,' they 'creep to our altars and partake of our sacraments that they may be qualified more secretly and powerfully to undermine the Church.' No heathen government would ever have tolerated such 'a religious piece of political hypocrisy.' This sermon raised a controversy of its own. One of Sacheverell's best supporters was Leslie the Nonjuror. It was congenial work for him to accuse the moderate Churchmen of entering into a conspiracy with 'Whigs and fanatics to undermine and blow up the present Church and government.' In another pamphlet he dealt with the occasionally conforming Dissenters, stripping 'the wolves' of their shepherd's clothing,* and exposing their hypocrisy and deceit. Schism was a

* See 'The Wolf stript of His Shepherd's Clothing.'

CHAP. X.

deadly sin, but to 'comprehend' the Dissenters was only to dissolve the Church of England and 'melt her down' into all the sects. Leslie was able in this argument to plead the agreement of the Kirk of Scotland, which had just sent a petition that in any Bill framed for toleration, 'the benefits of it might not extend to Episcopalians.'

'Moderation a Virtue.'

There were moderate Dissenters besides Howe who opposed the Bill and advocated occasional conformity. James Owen, in 'Moderation a Virtue,' showed that it was Christian and Catholic. It was no new theory, and there was no reason why it should cease, as the differences between Churchmen and Dissenters were really very small. It was not injurious to the Church of England, but tended rather to weaken dissent. It was not inconsistent with Nonconformist principles. The old Nonconformists, Owen showed, were always opposed to separation.

Lord Barrington on occasional conformity.

The same principles were advocated by Shute, Viscount Barrington, a leader of the Presbyterians. In 1701 he published a pamphlet, which he enlarged in 1703, called 'An Essay upon the Interest of England in respect to Protestants Dissenting from the Church of England.' Lord Barrington regarded the Bill as an injury to Dissenters. It was taking away a privilege, and the result would be that many moderate Dissenters would conform entirely rather than become ineligible for civil offices. 'There are many people,' his Lordship says, 'who do not appreciate a sermon unless heard in the presence of a knight, an alderman, or a justice of the peace.' He argued against the Bill from the numbers and importance of Dissenters. They were 'a fourth of the nation.' They were 'men of substance and of great influence in the country.' To disoblige them would be unwise on the part of the government. He compared them to the unhappy people of Rome under Tiberius, whose every action was liable to be misunderstood. 'Astrology,' he said, 'should be consulted what unhappy planet reigned when Nonconformity took its rise, since it is not to be allowed the Dissenters to worship occasionally in a Church.' De Foe wished, of course, that Dissenters should be eligible to civil offices without occasional conformity, and Lord Barrington wished the same, but maintained that the per-

mission of occasional conformity was an important step towards it.

Bishop Burnet defends occasional conformity.

When the Bill was before the House of Lords Bishop Burnet* spoke against it, drawing his arguments from the past history of the Church of England. It had been, he said, the good policy of Queen Elizabeth to allow Roman Catholics to hold office, on condition of occasional conformity. Her Lord Treasurer, the Marquis of Winchester, had protested against all the acts of the Reformation, yet he was allowed to hold his office because he conformed occasionally. He was known as a 'Church Papist.' It was the Pope who first prohibited the occasional conformity of the Roman Catholics. He saw that its tendency was to strengthen the Church of England. At the Restoration Burnet said there was an unusually favourable opportunity for settling all differences, but that opportunity was lost. Those who had the power abused it, and increased the differences when they ought to have lessened them. Because of the sufferings of Dissenters the Roman Catholics obtained a general toleration in 1672. But the result of this was the Test Act in the following year, which was passed with the help and concurrence of the Dissenters. After speaking of the indulgences of James II. and his schemes to overthrow the Protestant religion, Bishop Burnet said that King William came to their deliverance, and by the Act of Toleration had made the Church of England stronger and safer than ever. Since that time the Nonconformists had decreased in number as much as a third or a fourth. Before the wars, there was a great difference between the Puritan who was a Churchman and the Brownist who was a Separatist. The latter was hated mainly because he was a Separatist. This is now reversed. We show least favour to those Nonconformists who are nearest to us. Many people in his own diocese, Burnet said, frequent both Church and meeting; people 'who have no civil office and

* In 1702 the Bill was brought into the Commons. It was amended by the Lords, and a free conference of both Houses was held on it. The Lords, chiefly guided by Archbishop Tenison and Bishop Burnet, persisted in their amendments, and the Bill failed to pass. Next year a new Bill was introduced, which was also defeated in the Lords. It failed again in 1704, but passed by a coalition in 1711. The Act, with some others of the same kind, was repealed in 1718.

CHAP. X.

desire none.' If this Bill is passed they will continue to g to meeting, but will entirely forsake the Church.*

The leaders of the Presbyterians, Baxter, Bates, an Howe, continued to the end of their lives in unwilling sep ration from the Church. Howe and Bates both refused t be present at ordinations by Presbyterians, and evidentl lived and died in hope of such changes in the Church a would make conformity easy for the Nonconformists. Th most eminent men among the Nonconformists after Baxter and Howe were better known as preachers than as writers.

Dr. Bates.

and what they wrote is for the most part practical. Dr Bates's chief work, called 'The Harmony of the Divin Attributes,' is an elaborate and complete exposition of the scheme of Redemption, as it was understood by the Puritans. Adam, the first man, as the covenant head of the race, stood for all men. He sinned, and his sin was of universal efficacy. As the race was related to Adam, naturally the taint of corruption is in all, and because of the moral or covenant relation, it is imputed to all. The fact of original guilt is found in the cries of infants. The tears which are born with their eyes signify that they are come into a state of sorrow. It was remarked by Pliny how much more sad is the condition of man than that of the lower animals. They come into the world instructed to swim, or fly, or run. They are clothed by nature, and their clothes grow with their bodies. But man is born in destitution. The Pagans, ignorant of Adam's fall, accused nature, and 'under that mask blasphemed God, as less indulgent to man than to the inferior creatures.' But the explanation is, that man is a transgressor from the womb. The justice of God is defended in the way that it was defended by Job's friends,—on principles that are not applicable to justice with man. Dr. Bates supposes, that if all the posterity of Adam had been asked to agree that Adam

* Occasional conformity seems to have been practised chiefly by the Presbyterians. The Quakers, as we have seen, stood apart from all other denominations. Mr. Skeats says that 'members of some Baptist churches were forbidden to enter on any pretence whatever the established places of worship: inter-marriages and social intercourse with Episcopalians were equally prohibited.' These were articles of communion in the Baptist Church at Cambridge. 'History of Free Churches,' by H. S. Skeats, p. 186.

ıould be their covenant head, they could not have made any exception, for God gives His favours as it pleaseth [im, and if men had refused the headship of Adam, they ıight have been justly annihilated.*

Necessity of satisfaction for sin.

Reduced to his present condition by the faults of Adam, it was impossible for man to rise again. The darkness that had come over his mind could only be expelled by supernatural light. And though the arrangement that he should fall in Adam was not his own making, it was yet impossible that he could ever make satisfaction by suffering. The ffence was infinite, and Divine justice is infinite. Man ɔuld only have made such satisfaction as the devils make which is never complete, though the suffering be for ever. There was a necessity for an infinite satisfaction. How to reconcile mercy with inflexible justice was a mystery too deep for angels, but not for the wisdom of God. The eternal Son took flesh. He obeyed the law for men, and 'His righteousness is meritoriously imputed to them that believe.' This doctrine of satisfaction, in the form in which it was taught by Dr. Bates, was reckoned one of the deep things which reason could not discover. It could not be believed by natural reason, yet when revealed it is seen to bear the stamp of reason, that is, when the intellectual principle in man is enlightened by faith.

John Flavel.

The works of Dr. Daniel Williams consist chiefly of sermons, with his polemical tracts in the Crisp controversy. Matthew Sylvester, another eminent preacher, left no writings, except a few sermons preached as part of the morning exercises at Cripplegate. John Flavel wrote many pious books, but altogether of a practical character. The only work of Flavel's which gave scope for speculation, or touched on questions open to controversy, was his 'Treatise on the Soul of Man.' The immediate object, however, of this work was entirely practical. It was supposed that we have a sufficient account in the Scriptures of the soul's origin, and that Aristotle, and all the ancients who wrote on this subject, only proved themselves to be, as Lactantius says, 'learned idiots.' Moses explains it in a few words, where he says that God breathed into man the breath of

* P. 49, ed. 1674.

CHAP. X.

life, and he became 'a living soul.' The soul did not re
from matter. It was not born of flesh, but descended f
the Father of spirits. It is not as the Stoics said, a p
of the Deity. God made the soul. It is not one of His ra
It did not emanate from Him. Flavel supposes that
doctrine of the immediate creation of souls is clearly taught
in the Scriptures. The soul of a brute is dependent on its
body, but the soul of man is an inspiration from the Al-
mighty. All souls were not created at once, like the souls
of the angels, as Plato supposed, but are created daily as
bodies are generated. These arguments concerning the
origin of the soul are introduced for a practical obje
They are the ground of arguments for the soul's value, on
which are founded exhortations to repentance. To save
the soul ought to be the great object of human life. As
mariners go to sea, and tradesmen to market, that they
may get gain, so should men strive for the gain of the
soul.

On the soul.

The Nonconformists continued long faithful to the Puri
doctrine of the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures. Bri
Walton's 'Polyglott' was to many what it had been to Jo
Owen, an undermining of the foundations of revealed religi
In 1699, Samuel Clark, whose life was mainly devoted
Biblical studies, published his 'Divine Authority of t
Holy Scriptures.' This treatise was written with referer
to Simon's 'Critical History of the Old Testament,' a
some other recent 'assaults' on the Bible. Clark promi
to inquire into the manner of inspiration, and as far as pos-
sible to determine how much is due to the Holy Spirit, and
how much to the inspired writers. La Mothe, in an answer
to Simon, had divided inspiration into three kinds,—that
which is immediate, that which is by sense, and that which
is by reasoning. The immediate revelations given to the
Apostles were given in two ways. The truths were sug-
gested to their minds and they received them passively,
'like a piece of cloth that receives colours.' But when they
began to write, the Holy Spirit moved them and refreshed
their memories. There was first suggestion, and then direc-
tion or guidance. When the writers were going right
they were left to themselves, but when likely to go wrong

Samuel Clark on verbal inspiration.

they were checked and kept right. The Apostles added reflections of their own to what was suggested; and with these reflections, wherever reason was sufficient, the Holy Spirit did not interfere except to warrant infallibility.

Clark pronounces La Mothe's views of inspiration 'derogatory to the majesty and authority of the Holy Scriptures.' He promises to show that all Scripture whatever is directly inspired. For the Old Testament he has the words of St. Paul, 'all Scripture is given by inspiration of God,' and the words of St. Peter, that 'prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.' The Scriptures in general are called 'the Oracles of God.' This inspiration is further proved from the contents of the books. Many things must have been immediately revealed. Such were God's words to Cain, Lamech's speech to his wives, and what God said to Laban in a dream. Many things are not likely to have come by tradition,—as the agreement between Abraham and Sarah before going into Egypt, and what Rebekah said to Isaac concerning the daughters of Heth. Some matters of fact must have been immediately revealed,—as the story of Ruth, and that of Naaman. The Book of Job is also a history of facts, and though the speeches of his friends were wrongly applied, yet what they said was not wrong in itself. There are many things in the Scriptures which transcend human faculties,—as the dialogue in Isaiah between God the Father and God the Son. There are lofty strains not to be found in human authors,—as the description in Ezekiel of the entertainment of the King of Egypt by his dead confederates, or 'that elegant prosopopeia of the inanimate creatures and the dead at the destruction of Babylon.' These could not arise 'from men's brains, but must be put into them by the immediate Spirit of God.' The writings of the New Testament are equal sharers in this prerogative of inspiration. They are called Scripture, as well as the writings of the Old Testament. St. Peter speaks of St. Paul's Epistles being wrested by the unlearned, as well as 'other Scriptures.' The writers, however, were not merely passive. The Holy Ghost made use of their reason and understanding. Inspiration was 'attempered and accommo-

He proves it from Scripture itself.

CHAP. X.

dated to the particular genius of each writer, so that 't liquor savoured of the pipe through which it ran.' Th was denied by John Owen, but Clark thought that it mu be admitted. It was promised by Christ that the write should be led into all truth, and have all things brought their remembrance. All things which were matters of pu revelation were imprinted on their minds. It was necessa that the very words which they spoke and wrote should more than their own, if it could be said that God spake them and by them.

Maintains the Divine authority of the Hebrew points.

With a consistency which was fatal to his own theo Clark maintained, not only the inspiration of the words Scripture, but the Divine authority of the Hebrew vowe and accents. The points, he said, were as old as the conso- nants; in fact, the meaning of the consonants depended on the vowels. He thought it probable that the Hebrew let- ters, vowels, and accents were imprinted on Adam's soul in Paradise. As Adam was created perfect, the langua which God taught him must have been perfect too. Bish Walton said, that if the late invention of the points ma the Scriptures uncertain, he would retract his opinion, a acknowledge his error. Clark said, the consequence was evident that the bishop must retract. 'If the vowel poi are not coevous with the consonants, it is morally impo sible the true reading should be preserved, and deriv down to us, and therefore must needs be doubtful and un- certain. Whatever advantages the Masorites may have had, their authority at best is only that of men uninspired. The sense depends on the vowel points, and if these are not as old as the consonants, we are left to merely human autho- rity.' The inspiration of the Spirit, moreover, extended not only to the vowels and accents, but even to the division into verses, at least in the Old Testament. After many argu- ments, Clark concludes that the letters, vowels, accents, and divisions into verses are all of the same extract and original, of the same authority and antiquity.

Changes among the Presbyte- rians.

The Independents kept to Calvinism, and continued through the eighteenth century the representatives of orthodox dis- sent. The Baptist sect did not increase, but rather declined, and became partly associated with the Independents. A

ew of the General Baptist congregations became Unitarian. The most rapid changes, however, took place among the Presbyterians. In their history the student of religious opinions among Nonconformists will find a special interest. Many of them were moderate men at the Restoration, and submitted to the Act of Uniformity. Those who did not conform became by degrees more liberal in their theology, and more in sympathy with the tone of the Established Church. Many of their scruples as to conformity were of a personal character, as in the case of Howe, who objected to re-ordination. These scruples did not exist for the next generation. It may be said that the strength of Presbyterianism was ultimately absorbed into the national Church. Part of it doubtless went with the Independents, but how much it is impossible to determine, as the final distinctions between these two parties became one not of polity but of doctrine. The Presbyterians never had regular government by presbyteries. They were mainly represented after the Restoration, by Baxter and the less Calvinistic Nonconformists. As represented by Daniel Williams they are moderate Calvinists as opposed to the Antinomians. They turn up again as opposed to subscriptions, and they become finally the English Unitarians.

Thomas Emlyn.

For this stage in the history of Presbyterianism we have the best materials in the life and writings of Thomas Emlyn. He belonged, we may say, to the second generation after the Act of Uniformity. His parents were of the Church of England, and were worshippers at the parish church of Stamford when Bishop Cumberland was rector. They inclined, however, to Puritanism, and designed their son for the ministry among the Nonconformists. In 1683 Emlyn became chaplain to the Countess of Donegal. He had a licence from an Irish bishop to preach in the churches in Ireland, and would not have objected to episcopal ordination, but he could not reconcile himself to the subscriptions. When Dr. Williams came to London, Emlyn was chosen to be his successor in Dublin. About a year before this, Dr. Sherlock's book on the Trinity had been published. Emlyn and another Nonconformist minister studied it with great care, and their faith in the Trinity as it is commonly understood

CHAP. X.

was unsettled. The other minister became a Socinian, l Emlyn continued to believe in the pre-existence of t Logos, and that He was the instrument of the creation the material world. Emlyn preached in Dublin for abc ten years, avoiding controversial subjects, and confini himself to 'the *agenda* and *petenda*, and such only of the *credenda* as are contained in the Apostles' Creed.' He had begun to think the greatest part of controversial divinity as like 'the various philosophical hypotheses and theories where men in the dark are pleased with their ingenious romances.' This was said specially in reference to the doctrine of 'covenants,' which was the foundation of all orthodox theology, and supremely that of the Presbyterian.

Teaches Arianism.

Emlyn's orthodoxy was suspected. He did not positively preach heresy, but he avoided the themes familiar in orth dox churches. He was pressed by the other ministers in Dublin to resign his charge. This ended in his publishing 'A Humble Enquiry into the Deity of Jesus Christ.' The Dissenters procured for this book a 'presentment' by t Grand Jury. Emlyn was apprehended and put in priso The Established Church in Ireland was also roused to the danger of suffering heresy. The Archbishops of Dublin and Armagh, William King and Hugh Boulter, encouraged t prosecution. Emlyn was condemned and subjected to the penalties of the law for the publication of blasphemy. Bishop Hoadly, speaking of Emlyn's case, says that 'we of the Established Church can manage a prosecution ourselves without calling in any other help. But I must do the Protestant Dissenters the justice to say that they have shown themselves upon occasions very ready to assist us in so pious and Christian a work as bringing heretics to their right minds, being themselves but very lately come from experiencing the convincing and enlightening faculty of a dungeon, or a fine.' The bishop concludes concerning Emlyn: 'The Nonconformists accused him, the Conformists condemned him, the secular power was called in, and the cause ended in an imprisonment and a very great fine, two methods of conviction about which the Gospel is silent.' The rest of Emlyn's life was spent writing in defence of Unitarian, or at least Arian doctrines. In this work he was associated with

Samuel Clarke and William Whiston in the renewal of the Trinitarian controversy about the beginning of the eighteenth century.

Denies that Christ is the supreme God.

The 'Humble Enquiry' admitted that in the Scriptures Jesus is called God. This, it is said, was never denied either by Arians or Socinians. The only question to be settled is the sense in which He is God. Emlyn decides that He is God only in an inferior sense. He is not God of gods, nor Lord of lords, though He be both God and Lord. The supreme God is above Jesus Christ. In the Apostle's words, He is 'the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.' This subordination of 'the Son to the Father' is shown from many texts. The office of Jesus is one committed to Him, and when His work is done, His power will be again restored to the Father. Emlyn shows further that Jesus disclaimed all the attributes which properly belong to God only. He said that of Himself He could do nothing. He had only a derived power, and therefore was not omnipotent. He refused to be called good, because there was none good but God. This was the name by which the old philosophers knew God. He was 'the good.' In this sense Jesus refused the attribute of goodness. He was not omniscient. God knows all things, for His understanding is infinite; but of the day of judgment, Jesus said that no man knew when it would be, 'not the angels nor the Son, but the Father only.' Jesus did not merely say, that as the Son of man He knew nothing of that day, but as the Son, as the Logos. He was not the Father, and therefore He did not know the future. It is true that in Scripture Jesus is spoken of as knowing all things, and of being able to search men's hearts, but this power He had by revelation from the Father. Emlyn said that Sherlock's doctrine of three infinite minds destroyed the unity of God, while South's doctrine of three modes left no room for a mediator. It was therefore necessary, in order to keep the Gospel faith 'whole and undefiled,' to believe that God and His Christ were two distinct beings.

Answered by Joseph Boyse.

Emlyn was answered by his fellow pastor in Dublin, Joseph Boyse. This was the beginning of one of the long controversies which in those days were common.

CHAP. X.

Emlyn persisted in maintaining that the Father and t Son are two distinct beings. They were distinct in i tellect, in will, and in life. They were one in the same w as all believers will ultimately be one with the Fath That this was the meaning of Christ's words as recorded John's Gospel, Emlyn quoted the authority of Calvin, w said that the ancients abused the Scriptures in attempti to find in these words the consubstantiality of the Fath and the Son. The Trinitarian argument is summed up this brief syllogism. 'There is but one God, Christ called God, *ergo* Christ is the Most High God.' The answ is, that though Christ be called God, He is not that 'o God,' that 'only God' whom the Father is said to be. H Deity is not denied. This, indeed, is not denied in the Nice Creed, which calls him 'God of God.' Boyse made t distinction that Christ came from the Father by a necessa emanation, while creatures were a voluntary creation. In th way he preserved the identity of the being of the Father an that of the Son. But Emlyn, taking being, mind, and perso as meaning the same thing, maintained that the beings mu be distinct if the one was derived, and the other underive A being which has a cause cannot be the same as a bein which has not a cause. Scripture ascribes to Father an Son distinct actions, which require distinct minds and soul We cannot say that one mode begat another mode, and tha those two sent a third mode.

On the worship of Christ.

The worship of Christ was alleged as an argument for Hi divinity. Emlyn was moreover accused of not being quite ingenuous in remaining so long with a community of Christians who worshipped Christ as God. He vindicated himself by saying that he had never known any Christian worship Christ as the ultimate object. They worshippe the Father by the Son as Mediator. If they intended more, he never knew them express more, and the worship given to Christ in the New Testament was not, he maintained, of a higher kind than this. The disciples were taught to pray to the Father in Christ's name.

In the writings of the early Fathers there are prayers addressed to Christ, but only as the High Priest or the Inter cessor who was to offer the prayers of the saints to th

CHAP. X.

Do Roman Catholics give Christ the highest worship?

Most High. Emlyn quotes from M. Jurieu to prove that Roman Catholics do not give to Jesus Christ that worship which they give to God, but only that which they give to saints. They pray to Him to intercede for them. The objection was raised that by this argument Emlyn justified the idolatry of Roman Catholics and Pagans. If Jesus is only a created being, to worship Him is idolatry. The answer involved a discussion of the whole subject of worship. The ordinary Protestant had evidently come to limit all religious addresses to God only, and when worship was offered to Christ it was because He was God. The custom of the Roman Catholics had been to invoke saints and angels, Jesus, the Virgin, and all the immortals. There was a distinction of worship, but the Supreme God was the ultimate object of all religious service, and invocation to saints was included under the general name of worship. In old English the word had even a wider meaning than this, but among Protestants it had come to be limited to the immediate worship of the Most High God. Emlyn advocates for Christ what he calls inferior worship. This worship is said to belong to Him in virtue of His office as Mediator. He may not know all things, that is, He may not know them of Himself, and yet He may know all our necessities, and be by God's appointment the proper object of invocation. But this does not justify the idolatry of Roman Catholics and Pagans. They have no command for praying to saints or images. Jesus is the name above every name, to which all are to bow. God hath 'made Him both Lord and Christ,' and we are required to give Him honour and homage. But this is not said of the Virgin nor of the saints. God dwelt in the Shechinah, and was there to be worshipped. He did not dwell in the golden calf, and therefore the worship of it was idolatry. For this worship of Christ Emlyn quotes from many of the Fathers. They worshipped God and His Son, or God by His Son. The worship sometimes seems to be the same, but it is generally distinct. The Father and Son are not worshipped as one in the same numerical essence. Lactantius says that before creation God 'begot a Spirit whom He called His Son, which title He did not give to any other of the spirits whom He afterwards

CHAP. X.

Augustine worshipped Christ's humanity.

created.' Origen says, 'We religiously worship the Fath of truth, and the Son who is the truth, two indeed in su stance, but one by agreement and concord.' Augustii saw in Christ's humanity that footstool of God which in th ninety-ninth Psalm he was commanded to worship. Emly. argues that if Christ's humanity could be worshipped with out idolatry, it was surely not idolatry to worship Him a the Logos who existed before the world was.

Bishop Fowler on the pre-existence of Christ.

A tract of some interest in Emlyn's works is 'A Vindi cation of Dr. Fowler, Bishop of Gloucester, against Dr Sherlock.' Bishop Fowler had taught the pre-existence o the humanity of Christ. The 'man Christ Jesus,' he said 'descended from heaven' in the same sense in which He afterwards ascended into heaven. This theory was intende to obviate the difficulty supposed to be in the Trinitaria scheme, that if Christ existed before His incarnation only as God, how could He be said to descend from heaven His divine nature could not descend. He could not lay aside His uncreated glory, and His human nature did no yet exist. South said, 'It is impossible for His divin nature to come, because coming is a motion from the plac where one is to a place in which he was not before, whereas infinity implies a presence to all places.' The other alternative is supposed to be that Christ came in His humar nature; but this, too, South denies. 'That,' he says, 'which did not exist before it was in the world cannot possibly be said to come into the world, any more than the fruit that grows on the tree can be said to come to the tree.' The Arian had no difficulty with the descent from heaven. He explained it as Jesus Christ leaving the glory which He had with God His Father. Bishop Fowler explained it by the pre-existence of Christ's human soul, translating the words in John iii. 13 as 'The Son of Man who was in heaven.' Dr. Sherlock supposed that the Eternal Word for a time put off 'His visible glory,' but not His 'essential glory.' This was all, he said, that was meant by Christ emptying Himself, by His being rich and becoming poor. Emlyn argues that if this glory was created, it must be a creature, yet it is called by Sherlock an eternal glory.

Emlyn wrote some remarks on Leslie's 'Dialogues on

Emlyn on Leslie's 'Dialogues.'

Socinianism,' with special reference to the subject of satisfaction. He calls himself a 'Scriptural Trinitarian,' and declares his willingness to believe any doctrine which bears the stamp of Divine revelation. Leslie was master of a peculiar kind of logic, which made short work of all great controversies. He supposed the justice of God as independent of the Divine will, so that God could not forgive without that justice being satisfied to the uttermost farthing. After taking satisfaction in this rigid sense, he maintained the necessity of the absolute divinity of Christ to enable Him to make this satisfaction. It was a curious argument for an Arminian like Leslie, who believed that the satisfaction had been made for all men, and yet that all men would not ultimately be saved. Emlyn carefully stated the question as it stood between different parties. He showed that the Unitarian view of the atonement was simply that of the Arminians. They did not take satisfaction literally. In fact, they did not care about the word at all. It was not in the Scriptures, but they did not object altogether to its use. Much less did they object to the scriptural terms redemption, propitiation, atonement, and sacrifice. The Racovian Catechism is quoted in evidence, where it is said that Jesus Christ made an 'expiatory sacrifice' for our sins. Emlyn adds that Unitarians do not object to say that Christ died 'in our stead,' so long as the Antinomian sense is excluded of Christ 'sustaining our legal person.' Christ suffered to prevent our suffering, and that is dying in place of us. He did not give a satisfaction of infinite value. He did not make an equivalent for all the sins of men, but He made by His obedience an acceptable and 'rewardable' oblation. An infinite satisfaction was not necessary for pardon. Leslie's doctrine, according to Emlyn, makes God incapable of mercy. He cannot forgive unless His justice be satisfied. Even John Owen hesitated to go this length. He made the impossibility of forgiveness without punishment not to depend on any natural obligation, but on a positive act of God's will. The idea of a proper satisfaction by Christ supposed, Emlyn says, that Christ was a sinner. He could only bear punishment if He were a malefactor; but He was without sin. Baxter says that Christ was not

CHAP. X.

punished properly, but 'analogically,' and Stillingfleet say that Christ's sufferings 'were not a punishment in the most proper and strict sense.' The death of Christ showed God's love, but it is never said that it declared His wrath. The Jewish victims were called sacrifices and propitiations, but they were not a full compensation to divine justice. The great atonement among the Jews was made at the mercy-seat. It was an application to mercy, and not a satisfaction to justice.

On baptism.

One of Emlyn's tracts is on baptism. He does not suppose that this rite was to be administered to all persons, but only as an introductory ordinance at the beginning of the Gospel, or to proselytes from other religions. This was founded on the argument which derived infant baptism from the Jewish custom of baptizing proselytes and their children. Emlyn admitted that the argument was good, but it only extended he said to proselytes. The aliens were unclean, while those born within the Christian Church were holy. They were baptized in their parents. To invert St. Paul's words, and make them mean that because children are born of Christian parents they are fit for baptism is called 'a strange inference.' The Baptists tried to get over the text by interpreting 'holy' as 'legitimate.' This, Emlyn says, is evidently forced, but not more than the interpretation which makes children born in the Church unholy until they are baptized.

CHAPTER XI.

NATURAL RELIGION.—CULVERWELL'S LIGHT OF NATURE.—WOLLASTON'S RELIGION OF NATURE.—THE EARL OF SHAFTESBURY.—ANSWERS TO SHAFTESBURY.—ANTHONY COLLINS.—ANSWERS TO COLLINS.—BENTLEY.—WHISTON.—CHANDLER.—SYKES.—THOMAS WOOLSTON.—ANSWERS TO WOOLSTON.—LARDNER.—BISHOP SMALBROKE.—BISHOP PEARCE.—SHERLOCK.—MATTHEW TINDAL.—ANSWERS TO TINDAL.—SAMUEL CLARKE.—DR. STEBBING.—JOHN BALGUY.—DR. CONYBEARE.—DR. LELAND.—BISHOP GIBSON.

THE men who first discoursed of the certainty of natural religion did it with a good object. They wished to establish the certainty of our faculties against the sceptic, and so to lay a foundation for truth. It was generally assumed that when this was done, the certainty of the Christian revelation would follow as a matter of course. By the Christian revelation was understood the facts and doctrines recorded and taught in the Scriptures. Without the absolute truth of these, Christianity was not supposed capable of existence. Reason was an internal light; Christianity an external revelation. They were different in kind. In strict logic there was no analogy between them. The one, however, was the complement of the other. Christianity gave an external certainty to the conclusions of reason. This was the popular theory, but the foundation once laid in reason, it was impossible to restrain reason from further exercise. Before resigning itself to faith, it required to know the ground which authorized this resignation.

Reason and revelation.

CHAP. XI.

Authority of Scripture.

After the rejection of the infallibility of the Church, t Scriptures were supposed to be that 'word from God,' whi Simmias the sceptic had desired to give him certain concerning the doctrines of Socrates. The question how w know them to be the word of God required to be answere Lord Herbert said he was more certain that the intuitio of his mind were a word from God than that the Scriptur were the word of God. This was a conclusive eviden legitimately reached after what Hooker and Chillingwort had said of the absolute certainty of reason and the merel 'moral' certainty of revelation.

Culverwell's 'Light of Nature.'

A treatise on the 'Light of Nature,' by Nathaniel Cul verwell, published in 1652, may illustrate the position o the theologian who wished to abide by reason, and who ye received the Scriptures as an infallible revelation.* Culver- well was a Puritan, and may be reckoned one of the earliest of the Platonists of Cambridge. His book was published after his death, and dedicated to Anthony Tuckney, Master of Emmanuel and one of the divines of the famous Assembly at Westminster. It had the *imprimatur* of Edmund Calamy, and was evidently received by the Puritan leaders as an orthodox book. And so it was, even though destruc- tive of the fundamental principles of Puritan theology. The preface declares the object of the book to be the vindica- tion of 'the use of reason in matters of religion.' It speaks of the prejudices of some 'weaker ones' who aspersed reason, but it promises also to chastise Socinus for setting Hagar above her mistress. Reason is the candle of the Lord. Faith has the blessing, but reason is the first born.

No jarring between faith and reason.

There is not, Culverwell says, any irreconcilable jarring between them. They may give each other the kiss of peace, for they both spring from the same fountain of light. To blaspheme reason is to reproach heaven and 'to dishonour the God of reason.' Religion is not a bird of prey come to peck out our natural eyes. It does not demand the imme- diate destruction of the intellect. It does not seek to ex- tinguish the candle of the Lord. Reason is admitted to have been weakened by the fall. Like Leah it is blear-eyed,

* As this book was omitted in its proper place, a longer account of it is inserted here.

but not on that account to be hated. It is a picture that has lost some of its gloss and beauty, but not, therefore, to be destroyed. Men do not pluck out their eyes, because they cannot look upon the sun in its brightness and glory; and though reason cannot reach to the depth of the ocean, it may still hold up its head and be sufficient within its own province. This candle of the Lord discovers that all the moral law is founded on the light of reason, and that to this light of reason there is nothing contrary in the mysteries of the Gospel.

Light of nature seen in the Pagan world.

The light of nature Culverwell finds manifested where Lord Herbert found it, in the Pagan world. Nature, according to Plato, was the body of the Deity. This, Culverwell says, must be understood rhetorically, that God is the fountain of being, and nature the channel. In the same way he explains the words of the philosophers who call nature God. They meant that it is God's general providence which extends through all, and by which nature has its unchangeable order. 'Thus God framed this great organ of the world. He tuned it, yet not so as it could play upon itself or make any music by virtue of its general composure, as Durandus fancies, but that it might be fitted and prepared for the finger of God Himself, and at the presence of His powerful touch might sound forth the praise of its Creator in a most sweet and harmonious manner.'*

Eternal law really God.

This connection of nature with Deity is parallel to the connection of natural with eternal law. This eternal law is really God Himself; and natural law, as Aquinas expresses it, is nothing but the participation by the creature in eternal law. The law of nature is the first-born of eternal law, the beginning of its strength. As God 'shows somewhat of His face in the glass of creatures, so the beauty of this law gives some representations of itself in those pure derivations of inferior laws that stream from it.' Wisdom dwells in the mind of Deity. Law is an emanation from that effulgent light. In the words of Cicero, it is 'an eternal light irradiating from God Himself, guiding and ruling the whole universe.' This natural law Culverwell ultimately identifies with reason in man. 'Therefore,' he says, 'God Himself,

* P. 16.

CHAP. XI.

for the brightening of His own glory, for the better regulating and tuning of the world, for the maintaining such a choice piece of His workmanship as man is, has published this His royal command and principle of reason which He has planted in the being of man.'*

Extent of the law of nature.

The next step is to inquire into the extent of the law of nature. There are clear and indelible principles imprinted on the very being of man. His soul has seeds of light. These are created and become fruitful within this enclosed 'Garden of God.' These first principles are expressed in such sentiments as 'Bonum est appetendum, malum est fugiendum;' 'Beatitudo est quærenda;' 'Quod tibi fieri non vis, alteri ne feceris.' Over these reason broods as a bird on her eggs, and from principles of her own laying, hatches the laws of nature. All morality is said to be nothing but a collection and bundling up of nature's precepts. 'The moralists did but enlarge the fringes of nature's garment. They are so many commentators and expositors upon nature's law.' The law is written in the heart, and reason is the lamp by which it is read. Culverwell expressly refutes the Jewish idea, that the light was manifested only to the people of Israel, and that what light the Pagans had was borrowed from them. The Jews had advantages, but not in respect of natural light. This candle of the Lord shone equally on Gentile and on Jew. Hierocles says that 'to obey right reason is to be persuaded by God Himself, who has furnished and adorned a rational nature with this intrinsic and essential lamp that shines upon it.' Socrates and Cicero are quoted to the same effect. The Jews, on the other hand, say that there is no certainty in our common notions. Like the sceptics, they cast doubts on all the conclusions of philosophy. Their object is to limit certainty only to what Culverwell calls an oriental tradition, a Rabbinical dream, a dusty manuscript, a remnant of antiquity, a bundle of testimonies. 'O!' he exclaims, 'incomparable method and contrivance to find out certainty, to raze out first principles, to pluck down demonstration, to demolish the whole structure and fabric of reason, and to build upon the word of two or three Hebrew doctors that tell you of a voice, and that as

* P. 44.

confidently as if they had heard it!' The law of nature is shown to be sufficiently declared by the light of reason, but in a secondary way it is also shown by the consent of nations. They all agree in the common notions of religion and virtue. In this sense we may hear all men of all nations speaking in their own tongue the wonderful works of God.

Human reason is divine.

As the eternal law from which the human proceeded was identified with Deity, so the human soul or reason is supposed to emanate from God, and, therefore, to be divine. To this effect many passages from Greek and Latin authors are quoted and endorsed. Epictetus says that 'the soul is cognate with Deity;' and Arrian, in his comment on these words, says that there is a connection and coherence of souls with Deity. Seneca exclaims, 'What else do you call the soul but God dwelling in a human body?' These passages are quoted to establish the divinity of reason. Culverwell, however, takes a little liberty of interpretation, saying that they are to be understood as meaning that souls are the image of the Creator,—workmanship on which are to be traced the Divine lineaments of their Maker. This is enough to prove that reason is a certain light, and to be preferred to all tradition. The Roman Catholic Church, under pretence of antiquity and authority, puts out the light of reason. Lord Herbert, on the contrary, builds the Catholic Church on the first principles of religion that are common to all men. Culverwell has another foundation for the Church, which he calls 'a surer and higher rock, a more adamantine and precious foundation;' but he agrees with Herbert that the Church has a greater security in resting upon reason than upon tradition. Reason, he says, is the daughter of eternity and before antiquity, which is the daughter of time. 'Let none,' he adds, 'so superstitiously go back to former ages as to be angry with new opinions and displayings of light either in reason or religion. Who dare oppose the goodness and wisdom of God if He shall enamour the world with the beauty of some pearls and jewels, which in former days have been hid or trampled on; if He shall discover some more light upon earth, as He hath let some new stars be found in the heavens?'*

* P. 136.

CHAP. XI.

The Scriptures the foundation of the Church.

The foundation on which Culverwell built the Church w: the Scriptures. Lord Herbert included them among the traditions that were less certain than reason. Culverwell excepted them from the list of uncertain traditions. Here was the only question to be settled among the advocates of reason, and, by their mode of settling it, they were classed as Christians or Deists. Culverwell simply excepted the Scriptures. He did not reason concerning them, but received them with a Puritan's faith. Reason told him to rest here, and not to oppose mysteries that were beyond its reach. The Holy Spirit, he said, creates in the soul that faith which 'closes and complies with every word that drops from the voice or pen of the Deity, and which facilitates the soul to assent to revealed truths.' Reason knows that the Godhead is one, but the eye of faith discerns that in this Godhead there are three persons. Reason sees the immortality of the soul, but that of the body is disclosed to faith. 'The very principles of the Christian religion are attractive and magnetical, they enamour and command, they overpower the understanding and make it glad to look upon such truths as are reflected in a glass, because it is unable to behold them face to face. This speaks the great preeminence of Mount Sion above Mount Sinai. In the law you have the candle of the Lord shining; in the Gospel you have the day-spring from on high, the sun arising. Nature and reason triumph in the law; grace and faith flower out in the Gospel.'* Socinus put reason above faith. So did Pelagius, the great heretic of antiquity. He had but one eye in his head, and his soul was like his body. It had the eye of reason, but it wanted the spiritual eye of faith. The distinction between reason and faith was a sound one. A great deal that Culverwell says on it is excellent, but the subject could not rest where he left it. The foundation of faith had yet to be explained. After going so far with the light of nature, this sudden bound to the authority of Scripture was not likely to be admitted.

Wollaston's 'Religion of Nature Delineated.'

In the year 1722, William Wollaston published 'The Religion of Nature Delineated.' This work was not written in any controversial spirit. It was an effort simply to find out

* P. 152.

what would be the natural religion of a rational man, independent of any external authority. The author undertakes to answer the questions, if there is such a thing as natural religion, what it is, and how a man may judge calmly of other religions. He speaks of the subject as one already beaten and exhausted in all its parts by all degrees of writers, and he scarcely hopes to be able to say anything new, unless it be that he is to find a foundation for religion in the distinction of moral good and evil. If there is a real difference between actions that are good, evil, or indifferent, there must be religion. The converse is also held to be true. Religion is defined as an obligation to do what ought not to be omitted, and to forbear what ought not to be done. If there are such things, these must be religion, and that there are is proved from the nature of good and evil. Wollaston maintains that there is such a thing as right reason, that it can discover truth, and, therefore, to act according to right reason is to act according to truth. This is the essential law imposed on man by the Author of nature.

Reason shows that there is a God.

Duties or obligations imposed by nature respect either the Deity, ourselves, or our neighbours. Reason shows us that there is a God. When we find in the world a subordination of causes and effects, there must be a cause prior to all the others. If it be said that there is an infinite succession of effects, there must still be an efficient for these effects, a cause infinitely effective. It is proved by the usual arguments that God is self-existent, independent, and perfect. The manner of His existence alone is above reason. To the objection from the existence of evil, Wollaston answers, that moral good and evil depend on ourselves. 'If we do but endeavour, the most we can, to do what we ought, we shall not be guilty of not doing it.'* Physical evil is shown to be the cause of much physical good. The works of reason, wisdom, and goodness are everywhere so manifest in things which we do understand, that we may be satisfied it is the same in things which we do not understand. 'If,' Wollaston says, 'I should meet with a book, the author of which I found had disposed his matter in beautiful order, and treated his subject with reason and exactness, but at last as I read on,

* P. 71.

CHAP. XI.

came to a few leaves written in a language which I did not know, in this case I should close the book with a full persuasion that the same vein of good sense, which showed itself in the former and much greater part of it, ran through the other also.'*

Objections to a special providence.

The settled laws of nature are made an argument for the providence of God. By these laws all creatures live. They prove a general providence, but they seem inconsistent with the idea of interference for the special protection of individuals. The objection was put in the words that have been versified by Pope, 'If a good man be passing by an infirm building, just in the article of falling, can it be expected that God should suspend the force of gravitation till he is gone by, in order to his deliverance? or can we think it would be increased and the fall hastened if a bad man was there only, that he might be caught, crushed, and made an example?'† This, in other words, was the question of interference by miracle for special objects or in answer to prayer. Wollaston said that he thought such interference quite possible. He explained it, however, as not interference, but pre-arrangement. God knows the future. Though men are free to act, yet God knows what their actions will be. It is then 'not impossible that such laws of nature and such a series of causes and effects may be originally designed, that not only general provision may be made for the several species of beings, but even particular cases; at least, many of them may also be provided for without innovations or alterations in the course of nature.' In this way Wollaston supposes that 'the prayers which good men offer to the All-knowing God, and the neglect of others, may find fitting effects already forecasted in the course of nature, which possibly may be extended to the labours of men and their behaviour in general.'‡ It is also supposed possible that many things suitable to several cases may be brought to pass by means of secret and sometimes sudden influences on men's minds. There may be a suggestion, impulse, or other silent communication of some spiritual being, perhaps the Deity Himself. There are few men who are not conscious to themselves that they have been 'overruled,—they know not by what nor h

* P. 72. † P. 99. ‡ P. 104.

nor why, and that their actions have had consequences very remarkable in their history.' There may also be higher beings who are the instruments or ministers of God's purposes, and these may have the power consistently with the laws of nature to influence human affairs. It is concluded that a particular providence is as certain as that God is a Being of perfect reason. If men are treated according to reason, they must be treated according to what they are,—the virtuous as virtuous, and the vicious as vicious. The duty of worshipping God arises from His character. It is something according to right reason.

Human duties.

After establishing the existence of God and the duty of worshipping Him, Wollaston proceeds to human duties. Antecedent to all human laws, he finds the fact of property or rights. He finds, also, that whatever is inconsistent with the peace and welfare of mankind is inconsistent with the laws of human nature. These laws are found to extend not merely to individuals, but to families and to societies. Morality is shown to be rational and agreeable to the constitution of man. So far Wollaston delineates the religion of nature. From the religious capacities and hopes of men he infers the probability of a future life, and that God will satisfy 'a reasonable expectation.' But here he says, 'I begin to be sensible how much I want a guide.' The religion of nature was his theme, and he is unwilling to go beyond it. Whatever is revealed by God must be believed and obeyed, otherwise it is not treated as what it is. Natural religion is so far from 'undermining true revealed, that it paves the way for its reception.'

'The Religion of Jesus Delineated.'

'The Religion of Jesus Delineated' was added by another hand as a companion to 'The Religion of Nature.' The author lamented that Wollaston had not come nearer to Christianity. There he would have found a correspondence between revelation and the religion of nature, with the defects of natural religion supplied. It is doubted, however, if any heathen philosopher could have made such a system of natural religion as that which Wollaston delineates. He would not then have been taught by reason, but by God. This, indeed, was really maintained by Wollaston. With him, the teaching of reason was the teaching of God. He

CHAP. XI.

had argued from the fact of the reality of good and evil the existence of God and the duties of religion. This autho on the contrary, says there may be morality where there ca be no religion, for it relates to the existence of God and depends on it. A distinction was also made between the religion of innocent and the religion of guilty nature. The religion of a nature undefiled cannot be the same as that of a vitiated nature. The one requires forgiveness and the other does not. Natural religion says nothing of the remission of sin, though nature everywhere testifies of guilt. The duty of repentance may be inferred, but who is to declare forgiveness? Wollaston maintained that all sin must be punished, and that this is the teaching of nature. But if so, forgiveness is impossible, and so the religion of nature must perish. The foundation which Wollaston had laid for religion was to be overthrown, because it left no room for the doctrine of substitution. And here we have another issue, which separated men nominally into Christians or Deists.

From Christianity to Deism.

We pass from Christianity to Deism by imperceptible stages. The principles of the Deists were the legitimate development of a tendency that had always existed among reasoning Christians. In saying this it is not to be forgotten that all Deists cannot be classed under one category. Some openly professed Deism, and some were merely Deists by inference. Classifications of this kind are not fortunate. Mere names generally mislead us. It is safest to take every author as what he professes to be, and to estimate him entirely by what he says.

Lord Shaftesbury.

The Earl of Shaftesbury, author of the 'Characteristics,' is generally reckoned among the Deists. He did not admit that the term was applicable to him in any other sense than that of Theist. A Deist, he said, is not the opposite of a Christian, but of an Atheist.* He had written a preface to

* 'Averse as I am to the cause of Atheism, or name of Deist, when taken in a sense exclusive of revelation, I consider still that in strictness the root of all is Theism, and that to be a settled Christian it is necessary to be first of all a good Theist, for Theism can only be opposed to Polytheism or Atheism. Nor have I patience to hear the name of Deist, the highest of all names, decried and set in opposition to Christianity. As if our religion was a kind of magic, which depended not on the belief of a single Supreme Being, or as if the firm and rational belief on philosophical

Whichcot's sermons,* and did not seem to object to be considered a rational Christian. In fact he always professed to be a Christian, but his opposition to enthusiasm, fanaticism, and superstition, is often expressed as if under these he included Christianity.

Ridicule the test of religion.

In 'A Letter concerning Enthusiasm,' and in 'An Essay on the Freedom of Wit and Humour,' Shaftesbury advocated testing religion by ridicule on the principle that ridicule was the test of truth. He found his text in Aristotle's 'Rhetoric,' where Gorgias Leontinus says 'that humour is the only test of gravity, and gravity of humour, for a subject that would not bear raillery was suspicious, and a jest that would not bear a serious examination was certainly false wit.'[1] Ridicule was to be a weapon in the hands of reason. It could only prevail against what was irrational, and would itself become ridiculous if used against reason. Enthusiasm with Shaftesbury was a disease of the mind, a sort of melancholy which deepens if it is treated severely, but which disappears before raillery or 'good humour.' Too frequently when enthusiasm prevails in a State, and there is a religious 'panic,' the magistrate uses persecution, but this only increases the distemper. The policy of the ancients was different. They tolerated enthusiasm, but allowed philosophy to banter it. Shaftesbury advocates the principle of a National Church as 'a public leading in religion' which is a check on enthusiasm, but for those who dissented he advocated toleration as more salutary than persecution. He opposed enforcing uniformity of opinions, and he lamented that 'the saving of souls is now the heroic passion of exalted spirits,' and in a manner 'the chief care of the magistrate, and the very end of government itself.' †

grounds were an improper qualification for believing anything further.' —Vol. ii. p. 209.

* Bishop Butler says that if Shaftesbury had lived later, when Christianity was better understood, he would have been a good Christian. In the 'Letters to a Young Man at the University' he shows a very religious spirit, a great esteem for Christianity and the great divines of his age, such as Tillotson and Burnet. As the preface to Dr. Whichcot's sermons was anonymous, there was some uncertainty as to its authorship. In an edition of the 'Characteristics' in the British Museum, with MS. corrections and additions by Shaftesbury himself, there is the following memorandum:—'Mr. Churchhill, the bookseller mentioned in the title-page, told me in April, 1724, that the Lord Shaftesbury, author of the "Characteristics," was the publisher of these sermons, and, as he believed, wrote the preface.—April, 1724. M. Raper.'

† Vol. i. p. 19.

CHAP. XI.

This liable to be misunderstood.

What Shaftesbury says of the application of ridicule t test religion is capable of a good meaning, but it is al liable to be misunderstood. He assures us that he has r wish to recommend getting rid of all thoughts of religio by diversion or levity. He only wishes that men think c it in 'a right humour.' By this he means, as the contex shows, that we should not be hindered from a full examina tion by any morbid or melancholy feelings. A man mu be in 'ill humour' before he can believe that the world i governed by any devilish or malicious power. It is doubte if anything but ill humour can be the cause of Atheism. A free and cheerful contemplation of nature makes me Theists; and thus 'good humour' is reckoned the bes foundation for piety and religion. Shaftesbury's estimat however, of piety and religion was evidently not the popula one. He had no sympathy with enthusiasm, and unde this term he avowedly included the zeal which made men martyrs. He agreed, he said, with the Apostle who preferre the spirit of love and humanity above that of martyrdom He was no admirer of the early martyrs, who sacrifice their lives when by a little prudence they might ofte have saved them. He speaks of some French prophet who had come into England very eager for martyrdom. But instead of their receiving the honour of a perse-cution, they were made 'the subject of a choice doll or puppet-show at Bart'lemy Fair. This was more effec-tual than making them martyrs.' Shaftesbury adds, 'Whilst Bart'lemy Fair is in possession of this privilege, I dare stand security to our National Church that no sect of enthusiasts, no new vendors of prophecy and miracles, shall ever get the start, or put her to the trouble of trying her strength with them in any case.' He thinks it was well for us that Smithfield was not always used in this way. 'Many of our first Reformers,' he says, 'it is to be feared were little better than enthusiasts, and God knows whether a warmth of this kind did not considerably help us in throwing off spiritual tyranny. So that had not the priests, as is usual, preferred the love of blood to all other passions, they might in a merrier way, perhaps, have evaded the greatest force of our reforming spirit. I never heard

that the ancient heathens were so well advised in their ill purpose of suppressing the Christian religion in its first rise as to make use at any time of this Bart'lemy Fair method. But this I am persuaded of, that had the truths of the Gospel been in any way surmountable, they would have bid much fairer for the silencing it, if they had chosen to bring our primitive founders upon the stage in a pleasanter way than that of bear-skins and pitch-barrels.' *

The Jews could not endure raillery.

The Jews were 'a cloudy people,' and would endure little raillery in anything. Their sovereign argument was hanging. But they would have done more harm to Christianity if, instead of showing their malice to Jesus, they had acted 'such puppet-shows in His contempt as at this hour the Papists are acting in His honour.' St. Paul never had a suspicion of the soundness of his cause. He was always willing to try it against the sharpness of any ridicule. Socrates, the divinest man that ever appeared in the heathen world, was ridiculed by the wittiest of all poets. But what harm did it do either to his reputation or his philosophy? It injured neither, but rather enhanced both. It made him the envy of other teachers. He presented himself openly in the theatre that the people might compare his actual figure, which was by no means prepossessing, with the one which the poet represented on the stage. This was the best possible test of the real goodness of the man. He could not have given a more convincing proof of the genuineness of his character or the soundness of his doctrine. True wisdom goes not with affected gravity. It rather seeks the companionship of cheerfulness, and basks in the open sunshine of freedom. Jesus himself, according to Shaftesbury, was *sharp*, *witty*, and *humorous*. His repartees, parables, and similes were all of a lively and animated character. This was true even of His miracles, especially that at the marriage festival of Cana of Galilee. His instructions to His disciples, His discourses to the people, His reproofs to the men of that generation, had all a certain *festivity*, *alacrity*, and *good humour*, 'so remarkable,' Shaftesbury says 'that I should look upon it as impossible not to be moved in a pleasant manner at the recital of them.' The

* P. 29.

CHAP. XI.

Gospels, he says, are full of *good humour*, and the Psalms and Proverbs of *jocular wit*.

The disposition of mind necessary for the consideration of religion.

The words wit, humour, freedom, pleasantness, and familiarity, are all used by Shaftesbury as signifying much the same thing. After recommending the drollery of 'Bart'lemew Fair,' he speaks of a good disposition and composed mind as necessary for the consideration of religion. He laments the evil custom of thinking of it only in times of sickness, of private sorrow, or of public calamities. The mind is then disturbed, and instead of seeing the goodness of God men see only wrath and revenge. The truly religious man is not afraid to use freedom in considering the works of God. He does not hesitate to justify himself when he knows that he is right, nor freely to canvass God's ways when they seem to be unjust. Job was very patient, but he knew that he had done nothing to deserve the affliction which was brought upon him, and he said plainly that so far as he could then judge, God's ways were not equal. 'His friends,' Shaftesbury says, 'plead hard with him, and use all arguments, right or wrong, to patch up objections, and set the affairs of providence upon equal foot. They make a merit of saying all the good they can of God, at the very stretch of their reason, and sometimes quite beyond it. But this in Job's opinion is flattering God, accepting of God's person, and even mocking Him. And no wonder. For what merit can there be in believing God or His providence upon frivolous and weak grounds? What virtue in assuming an opinion contrary to the appearance of things, and resolving to hear nothing which may be said against it?' Those who, like Job's friends, put the lie on their understandings, are called 'sycophants in religion,' and 'parasites of devotion.' They deny their reason here, thinking by this to avoid any risk hereafter, and by an affectation of belief in what is too hard for their understanding, they expect favour in another world. It is 'a beggarly refuge,' but in much esteem among the teachers of religion. They recommend that men should 'strive to have faith, and believe to the utmost, because if, after all, there be nothing in the matter, there will be no harm in being thus deceived, but if there be anything, it will be fatal for them not to have believed to

the full.' This principle Shaftesbury reckons the foundation of doubt and perplexity. A religion which requires men to have such an injurious opinion of the Supreme Being could bring but little happiness in this world, and must be but a poor recommendation for the next.

Morality eternal.

Shaftesbury approached religion from the side of morality. He allied himself with the Cambridge Platonists, who, in opposition to what was understood to be the doctrine of Hobbes, maintained the independent, eternal, and immutable existence of morality. He was educated under the care of Locke, at least Locke had some share in the management of his education; but he openly disowned Locke's philosophy. In his 'Letters to a Young Man at the University,' he says that Locke, following Hobbes, threw all *order* and *virtue* out of the world, and that all free-thinkers have followed him. He frequently expresses his dissent from what we call the sensual, sensational, or sensuous philosophy. He especially finds fault with those passages in the 'Essay on the Human Understanding' where Locke fails to discover the universality of moral obligation, and where he expresses his belief in what some travellers have said concerning nations so barbarous as to be without the idea of God. That Shaftesbury fairly interpreted Locke, or that Locke, like Hobbes, cannot be easily reconciled with himself as to the foundation on which morality rests, are questions which we cannot now discuss. We have already maintained, notwithstanding all that has been said to the contrary, that Hobbes was a believer in immutable morality, and we have Locke's own express words that morality is one of the sciences capable of demonstration.

And not dependent on the word of God.

Morality had been made to depend on the authority of the State, the Church, or the will of God. Shaftesbury denied that justice and goodness were in any sense among things created. God is God, not because He creates justice and goodness, but because He is eternally just and good. If His will constituted right, He might will two contraries, and both of them would be true, which is impossible. One of the schoolmen, William of Ockham, said that, 'if God had commanded His creatures to hate Him, the hatred of God would even be the duty of man.' On Shaftesbury's

CHAP. XI.

principles this would be to deprive God of His mor character. In this he entirely agrees with Cudworth, wh classes with the ancient Atheists those who in modern time affirm 'that God may command what is contrary to mor rules, and that whatever He wills is just because He will it.'

Right and wrong discernible by reason,

The immutable distinction between right and wrong i discernible by reason, by the moral conscience, or, to use Shaftesbury's phrase, the moral sense. There is a *venustum* a *honestum*, a *decorum* of things which forces itself on th mind. Every one pursues a Grace or courts a Venus o some kind. It is the inherent beauty or symmetry whicl constitutes art. The musician knows that harmony does not depend on caprice or fashion: it is harmony by nature The architect and sculptor find their proportions in nature It is the same in morals. Harmony and symmetry are discoverable in the characters and affections of men.

And by their consequences.

From this view of morality, it follows necessarily that virtue must be the *good*, and vice the *ill*, both of every individual man and of the whole race of mankind. But though virtue is our highest interest, we are to follow it for its own sake, and not for any reward different from what it brings by its own nature. Unless we feel the pleasure of being virtuous, we miss the reward of virtue. Many devout people, Shaftesbury says, decry the present advantages and the natural benefits of goodness. They even magnify the happiness of the vicious life, and maintain that were it not for future rewards and punishments they would break through all moral restraints. But this, he says, is a kind of selfishness which implies the want of real goodness. In such mercenary virtue it is difficult to see what there is that deserves reward. To be bribed or terrified into being honest argues but little real honesty. If virtue be not estimable in itself, there is nothing estimable in following it for the sake of a *bargain*. If the principle is carried into a future life, it is but intensified selfishness. A religion which has no other foundation than the hope of heaven or the fear of hell is a false religion. It worships a god of terror—a fiend, and not God. True religion must have its foundation in the moral nature of man. There may be

morality without religion, but there can be no right religion without morality. We know God as a moral Being, and as such we must worship Him. Our love of goodness is the only measure of our love to God. Shaftesbury maintained, against the selfish moralists, that man is capable of disinterested love; that he not only possesses a moral sense by which he knows what is right, but that he has disinterested affections which enable him to love it and to follow it for its own inherent loveliness.

Rewards and punishments a security for virtue.

It is, however, admitted that the hope of reward or the fear of punishment may in many circumstances be a security for virtue. A man may have a real sense of right and wrong, and this sense may be in danger of being overcome by the force of passion. The belief that the violation of this sense has not only evil consequences of its own, but that it may provoke the displeasure of the Deity, must be 'advantageous to virtue.'* Sometimes a man may be in circumstance in which honesty is the cause of adversity, while the contrary would bring prosperity. In this case the consideration that honesty will have a future advantage may determine him to virtue. This principle is made use of in civil government, so that well-doing may be the interest of every one. It is used also in families. The master of a family, by 'proper rewards and gentle punishments towards his children, teaches them goodness, and by this help instructs them in a virtue which afterwards they practise upon other grounds, and without thinking of a penalty or bribe.' It is added that in the 'case of religion,' if by the bribe or reward be understood the love and desire of virtuous enjoyment, or of the practice and exercise of virtue in another life, the expectation or hope of this kind is so far from being derogatory to virtue, that it is an evidence of our loving it sincerely, and for its own sake.†

Deism not fairly inferred from Shaftesbury's doctrine of virtue.

It is evident that with Shaftesbury the inquiry was purely one of the nature and essence of virtue. No inference of Deism could fairly be made from what he says of the disinterestedness of virtue. The doctrine itself, that virtue should be followed for its own sake, is surely a Christian doctrine. The love which Jesus taught His disciples

* Vol. ii. p. 61.

† Vol. ii. p. 66.

CHAP. XI.

was a disinterested love, like the love of His Father who was good even to the evil and the unthankful. 'If ye love them that love you,' He said to them, 'what reward have ye? do not even the publicans so?' The peace which He promised His disciples was an inward possession, the joy of righteousness. He led them into the paths of wisdom, which were paths of blessedness and peace. It is true, however, that the Scriptures say a great deal about rewards for well-doing, both in this life and the life to come. Jesus told His disciples not to invite the rich to their feasts, but the poor, the lame, the blind, that they might be recompensed at 'the resurrection of the just.' St. Paul says, that for the joy set before Him, He endured the cross, and despised the shame. The same Apostle sets before the Christians of Corinth the glorious resurrection as an encouragement for them 'to be baptised for the dead,' though they had thereby to stand in jeopardy every hour. But if the dead are not to rise again, he admits the wisdom of the Epicureans, who said, 'Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die.' The Old Testament saints all looked forward to the recompense of reward. Sometimes it was in rich lands and prosperous families, sometimes in the natural advantages of well-doing, and sometimes in the joy of walking humbly with God. To work or love without the hope of personal interest seems beyond our feeble powers. We may have disinterested affection, we may be willing to sacrifice the life that now is, while we have hope of another; but the thought of annihilation seems to paralyse us, and to leave us indifferent to either virtue or vice. Selfishness, however, as Shaftesbury plainly shows, like many other words, has a good as well as a bad sense. He who is rich towards God is wiser than he who seeks only the riches of the present life. It takes nothing from the value of goodness that a man knows it will be followed by an infinite reward. Indeed, the only practical test of our duty is, that it conduces to our own well-being. Whatever tends to promote the health, physical, mental, or moral, of the individual or the race, points to our duty. Shaftesbury may have been opposing an evil which he found among religious people, but he knew and acknowledged that his own doctrine was that of Jesus.

Selfishness has a good as well as a bad sense.

CHAP. XI.

'Whatever is, is right.'

That virtue is necessarily blessedness, and vice misery, is a belief founded on the existence of a moral order prevailing throughout the universe. We only see a part of it. There are many apparent irregularities in the world, but we see enough to lead us to believe that 'whatever is, is right.' The philosophical Theist in every age has rested his main argument on the fact of the existence of this order. His greatest difficulties and perplexities have ever been to account for the disorders of the world. The oldest question in religion is how evil can exist at all, if God is almighty, all-wise, and infinitely good. Either He wills it or permits it, or He cannot prevent it. In the last case He is not almighty. If He wills it or permits it, that can only be as a means to an end, that He may overrule it and make it the instrument of good. The oldest solution of this question was to admit the existence of two principles, one good and the other evil. It is supposed that with the old Persians and their Christianized followers, the Manichees, these two principles were both eternal. The principle of good, however seems to have been prior to that of evil. But evil had its origin independently of the good principle. It is essentially the same doctrine, under another form, which we find everywhere among the Greeks. Their poets sung of a Prometheus who, mixing celestial fire with mortal clay, mocked the face of heaven. Unwilling to blame God for the evils of the world, men charged them on nature. This is only to remove the difficulty a step further back. The Indians supported the world by an elephant, and the elephant by a tortoise; but the question remained, What supports the tortoise? The Greek fables represent Jupiter as overpowered by necessity. He stood aside lamenting his troubles. He was crossed and thwarted by the fatal sisters. The theology of the philosophers corresponded to that of the poets. Plato made matter identical with evil, and again with non-being. He called matter *the unlimited*, leaving his commentators to determine whether or not it was *real*, which, with his Alexandrian disciples, meant eternal. As it seemed unworthy of the Supreme God to create a phenomenal or material world, the work of creation was entrusted to the Demiurgus—an inferior god, or perhaps one of the *hypo-*

CHAP. XI.

stases of the Godhead. The Demiurgus did his best for refractory creation. His materials were imperfect, and in a sense was his work. Out of Plato, Leibnitz derived t modern doctrine of optimism, or *all for the best.* Arc bishop King and the Earl of Shaftesbury had it from Pla or from Leibnitz, or perhaps from both. Pope wedded it immortal verse in the noblest of his poems, the 'Essay Man.' Plato said that there were five worlds possible the Creator, and He chose the best. The modern optimis do not limit the number of possible worlds. They only s that, of possible systems, 'wisdom infinite must form t best,' and in governing it must do all *for the best.* Thing which appear evil to us are in reality not evil. Could w see them in relation to the All of the universe, and the ob ject which the Divine Being has in permitting them, w should then find that they were really good,—

'Respecting man, whatever wrong we call
May, must be right, as relative to all.
Discord is harmony not understood,
All partial evil universal good.'

Pope's 'Essay on Man.'

Shaftesbury adduces the usual arguments for optimism and makes many of the reflections with which we are fami liar through the 'Essay on Man.' This world, regarded i itself, is imperfect; but regarded as part of the universal system, it is perfect. In an infinite universe there must be all degrees and ranks of being. There must be somewhere such a creature as man. And if disposed to murmur and complain that we are not greater and more important than we are, we have the same reason to be thankful that we are not less and more insignificant. It is according to infinite wisdom that we fill that place in creation in which we are found.

'He who through vast immensity can pierce,
See worlds on worlds compose one universe;
Observe how system into system runs,
What other planets circle other suns,
What varied beings people every star,
May tell why Heaven has made us as we are.'

Man's error in supposing himself the final cause of creation.

The great cause of our supposing irregularities in the order of the world is human pride, which thinks the world was made solely for man. 'The whole order of the uni-

verse,' Shaftesbury says, 'elsewhere so firm, entire, immovable, is here overthrown and lost by this one view, in which we refer all things to ourselves, submitting the interest of *the whole* to the good and interest of so small a part.'* Pope has expressed the same in the well-known lines:— CHAP. XI.

'Ask for what end the heavenly bodies shine?
Earth, for whose use? Pride answers, 'Tis for mine!
For me kind Nature wakes her genial power,
Suckles each herb, and spreads out every flower;
Annual for me the grape, the rose, renew
The juice nectarious and the balmy dew;
For me the mine a thousand treasures brings,
For me health gushes from a thousand springs,
Seas roll to waft me, suns to light me rise,
My footstool earth, my canopy the skies.'

The Ruler of the Universe thinks not of the good of man, the individual, but of the general good.

The Author of Nature studies the general good.

'Remember, man, the Universal Cause
Acts not by partial, but by general laws,
And makes what happiness we justly call
Subsist not in the good of one, but all.'

Throughout the orders of being, sacrifice is required. Each has to yield to the other. The vegetables, by their death, sustain the animals. The bodies of animals are dissolved, and enrich the earth. Man, in his turn, is sacrificed in common with all other things. And if it be just that these humble natures sacrifice their interests, how much more is it reasonable that man should be sacrificed to the superior nature of the world!

'See matter next, with various forms endued,
Press to one centre still—the general good:
See dying vegetables life sustain,
See life dissolving vegetate again:
All forms that perish other forms supply;
By turns we catch the vital breath and die.
Like bubbles on the sea of matter borne,
They rise and break, and to that sea return.
Nothing is foreign, parts relate to whole;
One all-extending, all-pervading soul
Connects each being—greatest with the least;
Made beast in aid of man, and man of beast.
All served, all serving, nothing stands alone;
The chain holds on, and where it ends unknown.'

* Vol. ii. p. 291.

CHAP. XI.

Individuals sacrificed for the general good.

The unalterable laws of the universe demand the con nual sacrifice of all individual life, for which nature ca nothing, except so far as it serves the general good. 'Her says Shaftesbury, 'are those laws which ought not, nor ca submit to anything below. The central powers which ho the lasting orbs in their just poise and movement, must n be controlled to save a fleeting form, and rescue from t precipice a puny animal whose brittle frame, however pr tected, must of itself so soon dissolve. The ambient a the inward vapours, the impending meteors, or whatev else is instrumental or preservative of this earth, must ope- rate in a natural course, and other constitutions must su mit to the good habit and constitution of the all-sustainir globe.'*

> 'When the loose mountain trembles from on high,
> Shall gravitation cease if you go by?
> Or some old temple, nodding to its fall,
> For Chartres' head reserve the hanging wall?'

Physical and moral evil serve the general good.

For the physical world the earthquake, storms, and ter pests have their uses. They may destroy individuals—ye whole species of beings—in one common ruin; yet the contribute to the general health of the whole world, ar save the *all* by the sacrifice of the few. If this be so wit physical evil, as we plainly see is the case, we may full conclude that it is the same with moral evil. Our passions our sins, our worst vices, may be permitted, or even willed by God, for the moral well-being of the universe. Those who think the world was made for man, may ask—

> 'But errs not Nature from the general end,
> From burning suns when livid deaths descend;
> When earthquakes sudden or when tempests sweep
> Towns to one grave, whole nations to the deep?'

Pope answers No, and refers to the general laws. He then applies the argument to moral evil:—

> 'If plagues or earthquake break not Heaven's design,
> Then why a Borgia or a Catiline?
> Who knows but He whose hand the lightning forms,
> Who heaves old ocean, and who wings the storms,
> Pours fierce ambition in a Cæsar's mind,
> Or turns young Ammon loose to scourge mankind?'

* Vol. ii. p. 215.

We are to look upon moral evil as necessary, no less than physical. It is God who is permitting, we may say *causing*, both. A thousand objections may be raised, such as that God is the author of evil, and that He cannot work without it. The answer is, here is the actual fact, and 'to reason right is to submit;' for

> 'All subsists by elemental strife,
> And passions are the elements of life;
> The general order since the world began
> Is kept in Nature, and is kept in man.'*

Shaftesbury's theology follows Spinoza.

Shaftesbury ended where all religious philosophy has ended since Plato, in a theology which resembles that of Spinoza, if it is not identical with it. There is *thought*, which has the *eldership* of being, and sense, which makes us conscious of the one original and eternally existent Thought, whence we derive our *thought*. The *All-true* and Perfect communicates Himself immediately to us. He, in

* 'I beg of you, gentlemen,' said Voltaire, 'to explain to me how everything is for the best, for I do not understand it.' Voltaire quotes Shaftesbury, Leibnitz, and Pope, and still pleads his inability to comprehend how that which is not good can be good, and how all can be for the best, when many things might have been so much better. Lucullus, in perfect health, enjoying a good dinner with his friends, may jocosely deny the existence of evil; but let him put his head out of the window, and he will behold wretches in abundance. Let him be seized with a fever, and he will be one himself. M. Jules Simon classes Voltaire with those who had never read Leibnitz. It is certain that Voltaire understood *all for the best* to mean that all was for the best as regards the Author of the *all* of nature, but not as regards individuals. After quoting Pope's lines that God

> 'Sees with equal eye, as Lord of all,
> A hero perish or a sparrow fall.'

and Shaftesbury's remark, that God would not derange the general system of the universe for such 'a miserable animal as man,' Voltaire says, 'It must be confessed, at least, that this pitiful creature has a right to cry out humbly, and to endeavour, while bemoaning himself, to understand why these eternal laws do not comprehend the good of every individual.' To ridicule optimism was the object of the romance of 'Candide.' Dr. Pangloss, the oracle of the house, proved admirably that in this best of all possible worlds the castle of his master, the Baron Thunder-ten-Tronckh, was the most beautiful of castles, and the baroness the best of all possible baronesses. Candide and his master, Dr. Pangloss, are driven from the castle of the baron; they endure untold misfortunes, but it is all for the best, in this best of all possible worlds. Shipwrecked on a voyage to Lisbon, they reach the shore on a plank, just when a terrible earthquake is destroying the city. Among the ruins of the houses they discourse of *all for the best*, and a servant of the Inquisition accuses them of denying the doctrine of original sin. For this Candide was flogged, and Pangloss was hung. Candide sails for South America, in the hope that El Dorado or Paraguay may be the best of all possible worlds. His hardships do not end here, and at last he doubts the truth of the doctrine of his dear master. He cannot see that all is good where there are so many bad people, nor can he understand how all is for the best when there is suffering and sorrow all the world over.

CHAP. XI.

some manner, lives within us. He is the original *Soul* d fusive, vital in all, and inspiring the *All*. Shaftesbu makes one of the characters in one of his Dialogues thu address the Deity:—'O Mighty Genius! sole absorbing an inspiring Power! author and subject of these thoughts Thy influence is universal, and in all things Thou art i most. From Thee depend their secret springs of actio Thou movest them with an irresistible unwearied force b sacred and inviolable laws, framed for the good of each pa ticular being, as best may suit with the perfection, life, an vigour of *the whole*. The vital principle is widely share and infinitely varied. Dispersed throughout, nowhere ex tinct. All lives, and by succession still revives. The temporary beings quit their borrowed forms, and yield their elementary substance to new-comers called in their several turns to life; they view the light, and viewing pass, that others, too, may be spectators of the goodly scene, and greater numbers still enjoy the privilege of nature. Munificent and great she imparts herself to most, and makes th subjects of her bounty infinite. The abject state appear merely as *the way* or *passage* to some better. But could w merely view it with indifference, remote from the antipath of sense, we then, perhaps, should highest raise our admi ration, convinced that *the way itself* was equal to the end.'*

Pope follows Shaftesbury.

Pope followed his master without a scruple, concluding the first epistle of the 'Essay on Man,' with the lines that have often been censured by Christian readers—

'All are but parts of one stupendous whole,
Whose body Nature is, and God the soul,
That, changed through all, and yet in all the same—
Great in the earth as in the ethereal flame—
Warms in the sun, refreshes in the breeze;
Glows in the stars, and blossoms in the trees;
Lives through all life, extends through all extent;
Spreads undivided, operates unspent;
Breathes in our soul, informs our mortal part,
As full, as perfect, in a hair as heart;
As full, as perfect, in vile man that mourns
As the rapt seraph that adores and burns.
To Him no high, no low, no great, no small:
He fills, He bounds, connects, and equals all.'†

* Vol. ii. p. 366.

† Pope's 'Essay on Man' was the occasion of many controversies. The Abbé du Resnel and M. de Crousaz,

CHAP. XI.

Relation of optimism to Christianity.

Shaftesbury's optimism bears the same relation to Christianity as that of any other optimist. We come back to the question, if the God of Plato is the God of Jesus, or if our philosophy is compatible with the Christian faith. The Bible gives an account of the origin of evil. Is it to be taken literally or allegorically? If the latter, it does not differ from the theory of Optimism, and becomes only a fable setting forth a philosophical idea. If it is to be taken literally, the difficulty is not removed even a step; for either God willed that man should fall, or, foreknowing the fall, He was unable or unwilling to prevent it. The Christian, no less than the optimist philosopher, is unable to understand why evil should have been permitted at all. Could not the omnipotent Creator have compassed His ends without the use of means? Why is He under the necessity of being limited by possibilities? We cannot answer. As Shaftesbury and Pope were believers in the life to come, they must have meant that the losing ourselves in the *all* of which they spoke was not annihilation, but a union of blessedness and perfection with the *All True* and infinitely *Good*. So that in the midst of perplexity we may still have faith,—

> 'Hope humbly, then, with trembling pinions soar;
> Wait the great teacher, Death, and God adore.'

Foundation of Shaftesbury's Deism.

Shaftesbury's Deism is founded on a few passages which look like an application of his own doctrine of 'good humour.' 'Do not imagine,' he says, in the character of a speaker in a dialogue, 'that I dare aspire so high as to defend revealed religion or the holy mysteries of the Christian faith. I am unworthy of such a task, and should profane the subject. It is of mere philosophy I speak.'* In another place he says, 'The only subject on which we are perfectly secure, and without fear of any just censure or reproach, is that of faith or orthodox belief. For in the first place, it will appear that, through a profound respect and religious veneration, we have forborne so much as to name any of the sacred and solemn mysteries of revelation; and in the

a Swiss professor, thought its general principles opposed to Christianity; but Pope found a vindicator in Bishop Warburton, who claimed the authority of St. Paul and Sir Isaac Newton even for the lines quoted in the text.

* Vol. ii. p. 208.

CHAP. XI.

next place, we can with confidence declare that we ha never in any writing, public or private, attempted such hi researches, nor have ever in practice acquitted ourselv otherwise than as good Conformists to the lawful Church, we may in a proper sense, be said faithfully and dutifully embrace those holy mysteries, even in their minutest pa ticulars and without the least exception, on account of the amazing depth.'* He was sure that if he were to exerci himself in such speculations, the further he inquired the le satisfaction he would find, for 'inquiry was the sure road heterodoxy.' This was a mode of writing common with tl Deists. It must have been provoking and offensive to a right-minded people. It is possible, however, to plead th Shaftesbury was only bantering the clergy, whose ignoran and prejudices may have been equally provoking to all se sible men.

His treatment of miracles.

There are also some passages in which miracles a spoken of in the same way of 'good humour.' One of tl characters in a dialogue says, 'No matter how incredulous am of modern miracles, if I have a right faith in those ancient times by paying the deference due to Sacred Wr It is here I am so much warned against credulity, a enjoined never to believe in the greatest miracles which ma be wrought, in opposition to what has been already taugl me. And this injunction I am so well fitted to comply witl that I can safely engage to keep still in the same faith an promise never to believe amiss.'† He goes on to say tha being satisfied of the truth of our religion by past miracle the belief of new ones might do us harm, but can never d us good, so that the best maxim to go by is 'that miracle are ceased.' It is possible that these things, with a fe more of the same kind, may have been said in earnest, bu they do not sound as if they were.

On the rule of faith.

In one place Shaftesbury introduces a professed Free thinker discoursing of the rule of faith as it is expresse in the words of Chillingworth, 'that the Scripture alone wa the religion of Protestants.' The Free-thinker asks th company to explain the word Scripture and to inquire int the origin of the collection of books which is known by tha

* Vol. iii. p. 316.

† Vol. ii. p. 326.

title. 'Is it,' he says, 'the apocryphal Scripture or the more canonical? the full or the half-authorized? the doubtful or the certain? the controverted or uncontroverted? the singly-read, or that of various reading? the texts of *these* manuscripts or of *those?* the transcripts, copies, titles, catalogues of *this* Church and nation, or of *that* other? of this sect and party, or of another?' * Then came the question of the obscure meaning of many parts of Scripture, the senses 'literal, spiritual, mystical, and allegorical.' In these difficulties concerning the uncertainty of the Bible as an authority, the Free-thinker was able to quote the well-known passages of Jeremy Taylor in his 'Liberty of Prophesying' and a similar passage from Archbishop Tillotson's 'Rule of Faith.'

Supremacy of reason.

Shaftesbury's aim was evidently the noble one of maintaining the supremacy of reason and conscience. The Bible, as it was understood by many theologians, was made to overrule the moral sense instead of evoking and educating it. They supposed that all that was recorded in the Scriptures must be right, just because it was there; and Shaftesbury refused to think anything right which contradicted his 'moral sense.' Whatever truth may be in the following passage, most men will wish that the tone of it at least had been different. It occurs as it were incidentally in advice to an author. 'In mere poetry and the pieces of wit and literature, there is a liberty of thought and easiness of humour indulged to us, in which perhaps we are not so well able to contemplate the divine judgments and see clearly into the justice of those ways which are declared to be so far above our ways, and above our highest thoughts or understandings. In such a situation of mind, we can hardly endure to see heathens treated as heathens, and the faithful made the executioners of divine wrath. There is a certain perverse humanity in us, which invariably resists the divine commission, though ever so plainly revealed. The wit of the best poet is not sufficient to reconcile us to the campaign of a Joshua, or the retreat of a Moses, by the assistance of an Egyptian loan, nor will it be possible, by the Muses' art, to make that royal hero appear amiable in human eyes, who

* Vol. iii. p. 320.

CHAP. XI.

found such favour in the eye of Heaven. Such are m human hearts that they can hardly find the least sympat with that only one which had the character of being aft the pattern of the Almighty.'*

Brown's 'Essay on the Characteristics.'

Among the opponents of Shaftesbury, the first that d serves notice is John Brown, vicar of Newcastle-upon-Tyn He was, in fact, the only one who undertook to reply Shaftesbury in full, that is, to expose the whole circle of h errors. Brown's book was called 'An Essay on the Ch racteristics.' It began by stating that the noble auth had taken it into his head to oppose the solid wisdom of th Gospel by the visions of false philosophy. This beginnin might give the 'judicious reader' a prejudice against Joh Brown. But this would be an unjust prejudice; for Brow invariably vindicates the right of every man to the natur privilege 'of seeing with his own eyes, and judging by his own wisdom.' He speaks of well-designing men who ha tried to make an unnatural separation between truth an liberty, and he commends the 'excellent Locke' for hi labours in helping to subdue this spirit. He firs considers what Shaftesbury advances concerning wit an humour. He complains justly of a want of precision in th use of these words. Wit and ridicule are confounded wit urbanity and good-nature. He defines raillery as 'tha species of writing which excites contempt with laughter. It is a species of eloquence which may be successfully used by an advocate in pleading a cause. Gorgias thought tha the best way to confound an adversary was to answer his serious arguments by raillery. Aristotle said that he judged well. Brown argued that this might do for pleaders whose great object was to gain their clients' cause, but to answer a serious argument by ridicule is not the best way to discover truth. Quintilian explains that raillery succeeds by drawing off the mind from the real question that is being discussed. The 'Tale of a Tub' was an exquisite piece of raillery, but, as a test of truth, 'low, vain, and impotent.' Cicero says that the proper objects of ridicule are certain kinds of turpitude and incongruity. But it may be used successfully against truth as well as against falsehood. In

* Vol. i. p. 358.

continental countries, the freedom of the English people is a favourite subject for ridicule. The French Catholic is never more droll than when he speaks of the Protestant claim, that in religion every man should follow his own private judgment. The Church of Rome has used every species of invective against the Reformed Churches, and the latter have not wanted their men of wit and humour. Ridicule and banter are now the chief arguments of the Free-thinkers against Christianity. Shaftesbury said that nothing can appear ridiculous except what is deformed. To this Brown answers that many things may be apparently deformed which are not so in reality. A man may endure misplaced ridicule when he does not know that it is misplaced. A just cause may suffer from being misrepresented before the multitude. Socrates was injured by the ridicule of Aristophanes. It is natural for men to ridicule everything that is strange or unusual. Ancient authors often provoke a smile. Homer was reckoned a dunce for telling us that Patroclus cooked Achilles' dinner and his own. The Princess Nausicaa, with her maids, going to the river to do the family washing, and finding the clothes useful for Ulysses, has been ridiculed infinitely. Modern refinement has been amused with the simplicity of the daughters of Augustus plying the loom to provide a coat for their royal father. Voltaire complained that nothing new could be brought on the stage, for the people ridiculed everything that was not in fashion. Reason, and not raillery, is the abiding test of truth. 'How insipid are now,' Brown exclaims, 'the repartees of antiquity! Even Tully does not raise a smile, and the *Sales Plautini* have lost their poignancy.' It should not, however, be forgotten that Shaftesbury limited the application of wit as the test of truth to men of 'justness of thought.' He did not approve of buffoonery, nor did he deny that before an ignorant multitude a good man might be injured by unjust ridicule.*

Shows that anything may be ridiculed.

Brown reviews at some length the whole question of the unselfish philosophy—Shaftesbury's moral sense, Clarke's

The unselfish philosophy reviewed.

* Charles Bulkeley, a Dissenting minister of some note, defended the Earl of Shaftesbury, on the subject of raillery, against the remarks of Brown.

CHAP. XI.

'conformity of action with the eternal and immutable re tions,' and Wollaston's 'conformity of actions with truth He pronounces the difference between these philosophers be a mere logomachy, and, in opposition to them, asser that the beauty, fitness, truth, or virtue of those actior which we call *morally* good is, after all, tested only by cor sequences. At first sight it seems to reside in the actior in an independent manner, but, on a deeper examination, is found to be admitted by these writers themselves to hav its value from the end to be obtained. Even with Shafte bury it looks to public interest or the general happiness c mankind. There must be a motive to induce a man to a action. That motive must in some way, however remot have reference *to oneself*. 'Men,' he says, 'are really in capable of the fancied excellence of loving a good whic brings no advantage.' As to Shaftesbury's Christianity Brown takes it for a mere profession, that he may have wider field for the exercise of his favourite weapon, raillery He thinks, also, that Shaftesbury throws discredit on th belief of a future state of misery considered as a consequenc of vice, and that he unhinges society by deriding religiou fear, which is natural to man, and which must have a object. He puts a high value on testimony, asserting tha from it we may have a confidence of the veracity of revealed religion; and he maintains that Shaftesbury oppose Christianity in saying that actions done from the hope o future happiness are destitute of virtue. He defines re ligious inspiration, and wherein it differs from enthusiasm denying that any of the elements which go to make up enthusiasm, were found in Jesus and His apostles.

Balguy's 'Letter to a Deist.'

John Balguy, vicar of North Allerton, wrote 'A Letter to a Deist,' which was entirely devoted to Shaftesbury's view of morality, or at least to an exaggerated form of it, as held by the 'Deist' to whom the letter was addressed. Balguy dedicated the collection of his tracts to Bisho Hoadly, the defender of 'light and liberty.' This is a pledge that the writer will give at least a reasonable defence of Christianity. He admits 'the fine genius' of Shaftesbury, and how unlike he is to 'vulgar authors;' but he does not overlook the 'absurdities' which are mingled wit

his 'fine thoughts,' nor his prejudice against the clergy, concluding that it was self-evident that those who are prejudiced against the Christian religion naturally dislike its ministers. His lordship had a mind to say something new, such as nobody had ever said before him, or, Balguy adds, would be likely to say after him. He dissents from the doctrine which resolves all morality into self-interest; but in the 'notion of disinterest' he cannot go so far as Shaftesbury. He admits that goodness, absolutely or abstractedly, must be independent of self-interest. Nothing can be more binding upon reasonable creatures than reason. A good law obliges us even more than a law-giver. God has no superior to prescribe laws for Him, yet He is eternally bound by the rectitude of His own nature, that is, by the rules of right reason. As it is with God, so should it be with man. But why, he asks, should virtue be stripped of her dowry and presented empty-handed? The motives of self-interest, held out to us in the form of rewards, do not weaken benevolence. They rather increase and strengthen it. He calls these rewards *positive* as distinguished from those which naturally flow from virtue. This distinction does not appear necessary to his argument, while it is the distinction which gives force to Shaftesbury's reasoning. The rewards which well-doing brings with it naturally, may surpass all that the imagination can conceive. But a reward in some form must be set before men. The fair ideal of goodness apart from this is far beyond the reach of men. To preach virtue without reference to a future life he calls 'a sort of religious knight-errantry.' Constituted as we now are, the belief that when men died they were extinct would 'damp every good design, and strike all virtue dead.' The gross mind, which is that of the great multitude of men, must have something substantial, something that will strike the senses and work upon the passions; and what can better serve this object than the rewards and punishments set forth in the Scriptures? Nothing can support a man under the pressure of any great evil but the hope or prospect of a good to follow. It was so with the early Christians, who, if their hope in Christ had been for this life only, would have been, of all men, most miserable. The

Maintains the necessity of rewards.

CHAP. XI.

beauty of virtue would not suffice to nerve the martyr a the stake. He would cry out, with Brutus, that virtue ha betrayed him. But let religion step in with her promise let her lift his eyes to the joys and glories that she has pre pared for him above, and at once he is comforted—his tor ments are forgotten—the flames lose their force, and deat its sting. The ancient heroes, who died for their countr were animated by other motives as well as patriotism They thirsted after glory. They hoped to immortalize thei names, and to perpetuate the fame of their deeds. Socrate was animated by a higher motive, still it was an interested motive. He fell a sacrifice to truth and virtue. But h hoped thereby to please God, and to obtain His favour. Balguy ended by saying what Shaftesbury had said, almost in the same words,—that a man led, by a desire of his own safety to follow virtue, would probably afterwards follow it from a higher principle. He added a postscript to the letter, in which he said that the more disinterestedly any agent acted, the more virtuous he was; and that if he had written anything contrary to this sentiment, he wished to retract it, for he was fully convinced that the highest principle of a moral agent was a love of virtue for virtue's sake.

Anonymous replies to Shaftesbury.

An anonymous tract in answer to Shaftesbury is 'Reflections upon a Letter concerning Enthusiasm, to my Lord * * *.' The writer finds that Shaftesbury brings Christianity down to the 'same level as Pagan superstition, makes Jesus Christ no better than Bacchus or Apollo, and does not in the least believe in revealed religion.' He complains that the first Christians are compared with the French prophets, and a slur cast on the sufferings of the martyrs and reformers. 'This gentleman's ravings,' says the writer, 'make him fit for a place in the hospital. Lunatics think the sober mad; so this infected person takes revealed religion as little better than frenzy and infection—a panic, as can be shown from the history of Pan and Bacchus, spreading itself from heathenism to Christianity.' The pamphlet ends with some banter, which is amusing if not clever, regretting that Shaftesbury was not a young counsellor, as he would have been a State oracle—a perfect Apollo—who would strike all with a noble sort of panic; and if ridicule

is to be the best remedy for enthusiasm, instead of the Bible, we had better read plays.

A 'Letter not in Raillery.'

Another anonymous reply to Shaftesbury was, 'Remarks upon a Letter to a Lord concerning Enthusiasm. In a Letter to a Gentleman, not written in Raillery, yet in *good Humour*.' The author discovers in Shaftesbury's writings 'a sly design' to set the prophets and inspired writers of the Old and New Testaments on a level with pretenders to inspiration. The arguments of this tract are extraordinary, which is more than can be said for the author's wit, which, however, is plentiful.

'Bart'lemy Fair.'

'Bart'lemy Fair; or, an Enquiry after Wit, in which Due Respect is had to a Letter concerning Enthusiasm to my Lord * * *,' was written by Dr. Wotton. It has two mottoes—

> 'Much malice mingled with a little wit.'—*Hind and Panth. travestied.*

and 'Answer a fool according to his folly.' It is dedicated 'to the most illustrious society of the Kit Cats.' The writer wished to try Shaftesbury's soundness by his own test and touchstone. He complained, in the end, of the manner in which men now treat religion. 'They creep into houses, and, with their "Tales of a Tub," lead captive silly women.' Shaftesbury noticed that the mode of refuting heretics by raillery was getting very common. The burlesque divinity, as he calls it, 'was coming mightily in vogue.' The most esteemed answers to the heterodox were those which were written 'in drollery.'

Mandeville's 'Fable of the Bees.'

The doctrine of *all for the best* took a practical form in Dr. Mandeville's 'Fable of the Bees; or, Private Vices Public Benefits.' It was maintained, as a matter of actual experience, that the vilest and most hateful vices of individual men are subservient to the well-being of the whole. A hive of bees, representing a flourishing society of men, were in great perplexity. The lawyers, physicians, priests and soldiers were all knaves. Avarice, prodigality, luxury, envy, vanity, abounded, and nourished the State in prosperity. The hive at last grumbled against the knaves, and prayed to Jupiter for their reformation. They became honest, and the hive or State was soon ruined.

CHAP. XI.

'Fools only strive
To make a great, an honest hive.
T' enjoy the world's conveniences,
Be famed in war, yet live in ease
Without great vices, is a vain
Eutopia seated in the brain.
Fraud, luxury, and pride must live,
Whilst we the benefit receive.
* * * * *
So vice is beneficial found
When it's by justice lopped and bound;
Nay, when the people would be great,
As necessary to the State
As hunger is to make us eat.
* * * * *
Bare virtue can't make nations live
In splendour; they that would revive
A golden age must be as free
For acorns as for honesty.'

Vice defended.

Mandeville defended the encouragement of vice as nece sary to the preservation of virtue. Even the violent pa sions in the community do something for the common goo He devoted a chapter of his book to an inquiry concernin the origin of moral virtue. He found it entirely in sel interest, and, in opposition to Shaftesbury, denied that m was capable of any higher motive. He disputed, also, th existence of a *pulchrum* or *honestum* in the nature of thing and tried to show that virtue and vice are not permaner realities, but varying in different ages and countries.

Bishop Butler on Shaftesbury.

Shaftesbury is one of the few authors who are mentione by Bishop Butler. To no writer did Butler owe so much a to Shaftesbury. The existence of conscience, a moral natur in man, our being under a scheme of moral governmen imperfectly developed here, the argument from this of a future life where it will be completed, and the present trial of virtue being the probation of the moral agent, are th main subjects of Shaftesbury's writings. In the preface t his Sermons, Butler points out a deficiency in Shaftesbury' doctrine of conscience. He did not give it *authority* There was no question of his having proved that virtue i naturally the interest of man, and vice his misery. Bu supposing, which indeed we must do, that there are par ticular exceptions, or that there are men who are not con vinced of the happy tendency of virtue, Shaftesbury has n

remedy. Men will always feel that they ought to follow what is conducive to their interest or happiness. But, by taking in the authority of that conscience which Shaftesbury yet believed to be in every one of us, we overbalance all consideration, and leave men under the most certain obligation to the practice of virtue. Butler dissented from what Shaftesbury says about the little value of good done through the hope of reward or fear of punishment. He calls *prudence* a virtue, and considers the contrary a vice. It is right that we should have a due concern for our own interests. There is nothing in this that can properly be called *selfish*. We have a faculty within us which approves of prudent actions. On the doctrine of *all for the best*, Butler speaks with his usual cautious wisdom. To account for the existence of evil may be beyond our faculties. We may conclude it to be voluntary, and overruled for good; but its origin is a mystery. It is easy for us to conceive that the commission of wickedness may be beneficial to the world. Yet is it not infinitely more beneficial that men refrain from it? There are, in the natural world, disorders which bring their own cures, diseases which are themselves remedies. The gout or the fever often preserves a man's life. Yet it would be madness to assert that sickness is a more perfect state than health, which is what is asserted by the Optimists as to the moral world.

The 'Minute Philosopher.'

In the 'Minute Philosopher' of Bishop Berkeley, the most of Shaftesbury's peculiar views are discussed. Berkeley did not deny the existence of a *honestum*, but he would not admit that the mere sense of the beauty of virtue was sufficient to engage men in the pursuit of it. He maintained, to effect this, the necessity of rewards and punishments. In a little tract, not published in the collected edition of his works, called 'A Vindication of the Theory of Vision,' Berkeley replies to Shaftesbury with some severity. He says that the doctrine taught by the author of 'Characteristics,' who makes reward of a good action nothing more than its natural consequence, is not religion in any sense. In such a belief Atheism is as serviceable as Theism, and fate and nature would do as well as Deity. In the 'Minute Philosopher' Berkeley has this dialogue on Shaftesbury's

CHAP. XI.

On ridicule applied to test religion.

doctrine of wit and humour:—*Crito* speaks first: 'Though it must be owned the present age is very indulgent to everything that aims at profane raillery, which is alone sufficient to recommend any fantastical composition to the public, you may behold the tinsel of a *modern author* pass upon this knowing and learned age for good writing, affected strains for wit, pedantry for politeness, obscurity for depth, rambling for flights, the most awkward imitations for original humour, and all this upon the sole merit of a little artful profaneness.—*Alciphron:* Every one is not alike pleased with writings of humour, nor alike capable of them. It is the fine irony of a man of quality, "that certain reverend authors who can condescend to lay wit are nicely qualified to hit the air of breeding and gentility, and that they will, in time, no doubt, refine their manner to the edification of the polite world, who have been so long seduced by the way of raillery and wit." The truth is, the various taste of readers requireth various kinds of writers. Our sect hath provided for this with great judgment. To proselyte the graver sort, we have certain profound men at reason and argument. For the coffee-houses and populace, we have declaimers of a copious vein; of such a writer it is no excuse to say *fluit lutulentus*, he is the fitter for his readers. Then, for men of rank and politeness, we have the finest-witted *railleurs* in the world, whose ridicule is the surest test of truth.—*Euphranor:* Tell me, Alciphron, are these ingenious *railleurs* men of knowledge? *Alc.* Very knowing.—*Euph.* Do they know, for instance, the Copernican system or the circulation of the blood? *Alc.* One would think you judged of our sect by your country neighbours: there is nobody in town but knows all these points.—*Euph.* You believe, then, antipodes, mountains in the moon, and the motion of the earth? *Alc.* We do.—*Euph.* Suppose five or six centuries ago a man had maintained these notions among the *beaux esprits* of an English court, how do you think they would have been received? *Alc.* With great ridicule.—*Euph.* And now it would be ridiculous to ridicule them? *Alc.* It would.—*Euph.* But truth was the same then as now? *Alc.* It was.—*Euph.* It would seem, therefore, that ridicule is no such

sovereign touchstone and test of truth as you gentlemen imagine. *Alc.* One thing we know, our raillery and sarcasm gall the black tribe, and that is our comfort.—*Cri.* There is another thing it may be worth your while to know, that men in a laughing fit may applaud a ridicule which shall appear contemptible when they come to themselves; witness the ridicule of Socrates by the comic poet, the humour and reception it met with no more proving that, than the same will yours, to be just, when calmly considered by men of sense. *Alc.* After all, this much is certain, our ingenious men make converts by deriding the principles of religion; and, take my word, it is the most successful and pleasing method of conviction. These authors laugh men out of their religion as Horace did out of their vices,—*admissi circum præcordia ludunt.* But a bigot cannot relish or find out their wit.'

Warburton on Shaftesbury.

The last of Shaftesbury's opponents whom we shall mention is Bishop Warburton. He vindicated the doctrine of *all for the best,* and opposed Shaftesbury only on the subject of ridicule being the test of truth. He urged the same objections which were urged by Berkeley and others. He addressed the whole race of Free-thinkers, as they are called, in the words of Cicero:—'*Ita salem istum, quo caret vestra natio, in irridendis nobis nolitote consumere. Et mehercle, si me audiatis, ne experiamini quidem, non decet, non datum est, non potestis,*'—a sentence which seems as if it had been written by the Roman orator expressly to suit the defiant temper of the haughty English bishop.

Anthony Collins.

'If I were now setting out in the world, I should think it my greatest happiness to have such a companion as you, who had a true relish of truth, would in earnest seek it with me, from whom I might receive it undisguised, and to whom I might communicate what I thought true, freely.' These were the words of John Locke, the year before he died, to his young and dear friend Anthony Collins, a gentleman by birth, education, and fortune. It is supposed that if Locke had lived to see the full development of his disciple, he would no longer have regarded him as a friend either to himself or to truth. Of the soundness or unsoundness of this conjecture it is not necessary to speak, but the relation

CHAP. XI.

between Locke and Collins must not be overlooked if we are fully to understand the position of the latter. Locke had raised the question which for the greater part of the last century was the 'solitary thesis of Christian Theology' —the relation of reason to revelation, or the right of reason to be heard in matters belonging to religion. It was no new question, nor a question that belongs to any particular time, but one that is forced upon us as men, as Christians, and specially as Protestants.

Use of reason in religion.

'The use of Reason in Propositions, the evidence whereof depends upon human testimony,' was the subject of one of Collins's first essays. He defined reason as the faculty whereby the mind perceives the truth or the falsehood, the probability or the improbability, of anything which is proposed to it. Revealed religion must depend either on an immediate manifestation of truth by the Divine Being directly to the individual mind, or on a revelation once given and coming to us through the medium of testimony. If the contents of a revelation depending on testimony contradicted our reason, we must reject it. If, for instance, it contained the doctrine of transubstantiation, we could have no alternative but to reject it, for reason is the gift of God, and that which is irrational cannot come from God. No miracle can prove a doctrine to be divine which is in itself repugnant to our natural ideas. Collins did not carry this principle to any unreasonable length. He admitted that there was an infinite world lying beyond what is known to us. Our reason is not to be the measure of possibility, but it *is* to be the judge of what is contradictory or not contradictory. A miracle—such, for instance, as that an oak, which requires centuries for its full growth, should spring up in an hour, is in nowise impossible. It may be improbable, but there is no contradiction in the proposition. The distinction between *above reason* and *contrary to reason* is rejected as wanting in definiteness. Under pretence of *above reason* some divines advocate mysteries and contradictions. Now a proposition considered as an object of assent or dissent, is either agreeable to reason or it is not. There is no third category to embrace propositions that do not fall under one or other of these heads.

Revelation must not contradict reason.

Revelation—that is, the revelation in the Scriptures—comes to us on human testimony. The credibility of the witnesses, and the credibility of the things professed to be revealed, must both be considered. However great the external evidence for revelation may be, it can never be equal to our perception of a self-evident proposition. In this doctrine Collins only said what had been frequently repeated by Archbishop Tillotson and which was deduced from the teaching of Locke, who says that we cannot be obliged, 'where we have the clear and evident sentence of reason, to quit it for the contrary opinion, under the pretence that it is a matter of faith, which can have no authority against the clear and plain dictates of reason.'

Contradictions, however, may be only apparent.

But a supposed revelation should not be rejected because of any merely apparent contradiction. If it comes to us with even the least degree of evidence, it is one of the uses of reason to endeavour to find out if it will bear a rational explication. It may be necessary for a revelation which is addressed to the minds of the multitude to speak in popular language, and not in that which strictly corresponds to the ideas of reason and philosophy. We are tc expect, for instance, that God will be represented as possessing human qualities; that He will have parts and passions, though men who have thought deeply on the being of God know that these things are improperly attributed to Him. Revelation, then, to be useful, and credible to the ordinary mind, must consist of words whose literal meaning is false, but whose real meaning is consistent with all that the mind of the philosopher knows to be true. And this is just what we find in the Scriptures. They speak of God as resting, repenting, being angry, and appearing in the likeness of man. Yet they also say that He is a spirit and invisible, and therefore it is only by metaphor that we ascribe to Him parts and passions. There is yet, Collins says, a further use of reason, and that is, not to reject the whole of the Scriptures for some parts which cannot be supposed to come from God. If they contain passages which could not have been written by the persons to whom they are ascribed, it is only the respect due to these writings to admit that these passages have been added at a later date. Such are the

CHAP. XI.

records of the deaths of Moses and of Joshua; the words *unto this day* frequently occurring in the Pentateuch, and the statement in Exodus that the children of Israel did eat manna forty years, which could not have been written by Moses, as he died before the forty years were expired.

'Vindication of the Divine Attributes.'

Among the early tracts published by Collins, the only two of much theological significance were, 'A Vindication of the Divine Attributes,' in reply to Archbishop King's famous sermon on Predestination, and a 'Letter to Dodwell,' on the immortality of the soul. The first of these consisted of some judicious remarks in defence of the capacity of the human mind to know God. The being, nature, or essence of God is admitted to be above human knowledge; but it is maintained that through those attributes which are common to God and man, we have the means of arriving at positive ideas concerning God. That He is wise, good, and powerful may be predicated of Him as truly as of man, and the words applied to Him have a meaning as certain and definite as when applied to men. But for this, the very possibility of revelation could not exist. The Archbishop, Collins maintains, gives up the case to Bayle, who, after setting forth the difficulties that meet us concerning the divine attributes, said with an ironical scepticism, that we must keep close to the Scriptures, and *captivate the understanding to the obedience of faith*. Tertullian was not a little mistaken when he said that 'the merest mechanic among Christians apprehends God, and can answer the question which so puzzled the greatest of the heathen philosophers.' But though Tertullian over-estimated the knowledge of Christian mechanics, we have surely gained something more by our study of philosophy and the revelation in the Scriptures, than to run into the opinion of Simonides and Cicero, and to esteem the question as obscure and doubtful as ever. The 'Letter to Dodwell' concerned a controversy in which Dodwell was engaged with Samuel Clarke. Among his arguments for the natural immortality of the soul, Clarke brought forward its immateriality. What is not material, he said, could not be dissolved. Dodwell, who was the High Church eccentricity of his day, maintained that the soul was naturally

mortal, but immortality was infused into it as a 'baptismal gift.' Collins, who did not believe in the supernatural virtue of baptism to convey immortality, wrote to Dodwell, not denying that the soul was by nature immortal, but impugning the arguments by which Clarke had endeavoured to prove it. Before speaking of materiality or immateriality, Collins said that Clarke should first have defined *substance*, for who knows if the substance or substratum of spirit is really different from the substance or substratum of matter? But taking matter in its vulgar sense, Clarke's proof is still inconclusive, for he has granted that God may have superadded to matter the power of thinking. We cannot, then, conclude its immateriality from the mere fact of its being a thinking substance. If from this we are to argue immateriality, and from immateriality immortality, by the same argument that we prove the immortality of the human soul we prove the immortality of all sensible creatures in the universe.

Immateriality of the soul does not prove its immortality.

In 1713 Collins published 'A Discourse of Free-thinking, occasioned by the Rise and Growth of a Sect called Free-thinkers.' This treatise was a further application or development of the principles set forth in the 'Essay on the Use of Reason.' It is probable that, by this time, the words 'free-thinking' were used in a bad sense; but Collins throughout his book uses them in a good sense, including among free-thinkers such men as Milton, Bishop Wilkins, Cudworth, More, Locke, and the prince of the sect, John Tillotson, Archbishop of Canterbury. Collins takes it as a thing certain that we must reason, and if we are to reason there must be some self-evident truths as the foundation of our reasoning. To go about to prove free-thinking a duty is to try to prove what is already more evident than any argument which can be brought forward to support it. There is no truth forbidden to man, and there is no surer way of reaching truth than by examining any subject fairly and thinking of it freely. This impartiality of judgment is as necessary in religion as in anything else. The Bible, which contains God's Revelation to man, is a miscellaneous collection of books, written at different times and in different languages, and requiring considerable learning and

'Discourse of Free-thinking.'

CHAP. XI.

careful study to find out the meaning of all that it contain Great knowledge and a clear understanding are necessary to understand Homer, because of the many allusions to different sciences and arts—much more are they necessary to understand the Bible. The only way to arrive at perfection in any science is by thought and inquiry—much more in the sublimest of all sciences, theology. Indeed, the revelation in the Bible is a revelation to us only as we understand it. When Jesus bids us love our enemies and to him that takes away our coat to give our cloak also, He laid down a general principle, and left it to the reason of men to make the necessary restrictions in any given case. If we take the words of Scripture without examination and understan them literally when they speak of God, we can never ris to the true idea of the nature of God. It is only by reasoning we can know that God is not a body but a spirit. The Pagan priests kept the people at a distance. They forbade inquiry, and would not perform their miracles except in the presence of those who believed. Some Christians act on th same principle. When we propose, Collins says, to conside the truth of the Christian religion, we are met by a cry of the danger and sinfulness of thinking on such a subject. Bu the devil's kingdom has no greater enemy than the hones free-thinker. After the Revolution in England, when me began freely to use their reason, the devil's power visibl declined. It is true that since 'the reign of Dr. Sacheverell the witches have come back, and the devils have returned to their old pranks of metamorphosing themselves into cats.'

Duty of free-thinking.

There are certain opinions held by some to be necessary to salvation. In a matter where the interest of every man is so great there ought to be free thinking, that we may find out the right opinion. The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel must ask the heathen to think freely; and surely after the heathen have received the Gospel they are not to be asked to cease using their reason. The design of the Gospel was to set men to examine the former beliefs, to inquire freely, that they may have a rational faith and the religion of a sound mind. Jesus particularly charges us to search the Scriptures. He bids us take heed how we hear. We are not to surrender o

judgments to our fathers or mothers, Church rulers or preachers. Dr. Whitby says that we should call no man guide or master upon earth, no Fathers, no Church, no Council. If we take the priests for our guides we shall find them calling each other atheists, as Carroll does Samuel Clarke, Turner the author of 'The Intellectual System of the Universe,' and Dr. Hickes Archbishop Tillotson. Some will tell us that the Bible is inspired every word of it infallibly, while the priests of Rome will answer that it is so corrupt that there is no safety but in following the Church. Some will maintain that Episcopacy is of divine origin, in spite of one of the plainest facts in history that the Church of England always, till the Act of Uniformity, held Presbyterian ordination to be valid. Our reliance must not be on priests, but on the honest use of the faculties which God has given us. It may be objected that to think freely on such deep subjects as those which concern religion is beyond the capacity of the multitude. To which the answer is, that the obligation does not rest on any man to engage in inquiries for which he knows he has not sufficient qualifications.

'Essay on the Thirty-Nine Articles.'

Collins engaged in several controversies, and wrote many tracts on different subjects, especially an 'Essay on the Thirty-Nine Articles,' with reference to the clause concerning the authority of the Church in controversies of faith; but it was not till 1724 that he touched the question of prophecy—the subject on which he came most directly in collision with the popular Christianity of his time. 'The Discourse of the Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion' was a bold book, but it was the natural growth of Collins's mind. It was the work of a man who had real difficulties, and who wished to see them honestly solved. It was the application to prophecy of the principles which he had learned from Locke, and which he had been preaching in every tract he had written. The preface was a re-assertion of the right of every man to think for himself, and the duty of every man to think freely. Not to permit learned and ingenious men, Collins said, to defend their opinions, seems as if we distrusted the truth of what we ourselves believed. Especially does the obligation rest on

CHAP. XI.

the clergy honestly to find out the truth. It is their business to inquire into the mind of God, and impartially to study and examine the Scriptures. Francis Hare, afterwards Bishop of Chichester, had written a tract ironically persuading the clergy not to study the Scriptures, because of the difficulties and discouragements attending that study. Collins, referring to this tract, maintained it to be the imperative duty of the clergy to study the Bible rather than Horace or Terence, to find out the meaning of the word of God and to make it known to the people, rather than 'to illustrate drunken catches, explain obscene jests, or make happy emendations of passages that a modest man would blush to look at.'

'The Grounds and Reasons.'

'The Grounds and Reasons' took the form of a letter to a 'Divine of North Britain.' After congratulating the northern divine that earnest inquiry was at length beginning to reach Scotland, the land of the tenaciously orthodox, Collins stated his first proposition, 'That Christianity is founded on Judaism,' and then his second, 'That the Apostles ground and prove Christianity from the Old Te tament.' Under this second proposition came the *cas belli.* Collins enumerated the many places in the Ne Testament where a passage in the Old is introduced with the words, *thus was fulfilled* what was said by the prophet. Such were Mary's being with child by the Holy Ghost, the angel foretelling the birth of Jesus, His being born at Bethlehem, His flight into Egypt, the slaughter of the innocents, His dwelling at Nazareth and at Capernaum, in the borders of Zabulon and Naphtali. The writings of the New Testament only confirm and explain the Christianity of the Old, for in them, as the Church of England says, 'everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ.' It is the law of religion that every new development finds its essence in the old one out of which it has sprung. The mission of Moses supposed a former revelation. Many of his rites were in existence among the Pagans, especially the Egyptians, t whose religion the Israelites seem at one time to have conformed. The mission of Zoroaster supposed the religion of the Magians, that of Mahomet Christianity, as Christianity supposed Judaism. Jesus and His Apostles appeal to the

prophecies of the Old Testament to establish the truth of what they taught. If these proofs are valid, Christianity is established; but if they are invalid, then Christianity is false.

Collins himself does not take this alternative. He merely speaks as a sceptic inquiring into the value of prophecy as an evidence of Christianity. By comparing the New Testament with the Old he finds that the prophecies are not to be taken in their literal sense; that the writers of the New Testament did not so take them; that almost all commentators on the Bible, both ancient and modern, have considered them as applied only in a secondary, typical, mystical, allegorical, or enigmatical sense. For example, Matt. i. 22, 23:—'All this was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying, Behold a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Immanuel.' Now the words as they stand in Isaiah vii. 14, in their obvious and literal sense, relate to a *young woman* in the days of Ahaz, king of Judah. The verses which follow, including the eighth chapter of Isaiah, show plainly that the child was to be Isaiah's own son, who was also called Maher-shalal-hash-baz. Again, Matt. ii. 15, 'That it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Out of Egypt have I called my son.' The words occur in Hosea xi. 1, where, in their obvious sense, they are no prophecy, but relate to God's bringing the children of Israel out of Egypt. In Matt. ii. 23, it is said of Jesus: 'He came and dwelt at Nazareth, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets, saying, He shall be called a Nazarene.' As there is no such passage in any of the prophets, this cannot be a literal prophecy. In Matt. xi. 14, Jesus says of St. John the Baptist: 'This is Elias, which was for to come.' If Jesus referred to Malachi iv. 5, then this prophecy was not fulfilled literally, as Elijah only came *mystically* in John the Baptist. In Matt. xiii. 14, 15, Jesus applies to the Jews, as a prophecy, the words of Isaiah vi. 9: 'By hearing ye shall hear and shall not understand,' which, in their literal sense, relate obviously to the obstinate Jews of Isaiah's day. Collins says that, to produce such passages as these from

Prophecies have a sense typical or secondary.

CHAP. XI.

New Testament writers as *literal* fulfilments, and therefo proofs of Christianity, is to give up the cause of Christianit to its enemies. He then explains what is meant by typical and allegorical. It was such a sense as no one could have discovered in the passages quoted in the New Testament simply as they stand in the Old, so that prophecy was truly a *light* shining in a dark place; in Collins's judgment, the light in no way overcoming the darkness.

William Whiston on prophecy.

The 'Discourse of the Grounds' had a second part, which consisted of considerations on the scheme of interpreting prophecy proposed by William Whiston in opposition to the allegorical method. Whiston had been Boyle Lecturer, and had taken prophecy for his subject. He strongly opposed the principle which admitted a prophecy to have a double sense, maintaining that, if we say the predictions which refer to the Messiah had a primary fulfilment in Old Testament times, and only a secondary or typical fulfilment in Jesus of Nazareth, we lose the advantage of the Old Testament predictions as proofs of Christianity. But, as it was impossible for Whiston to prove that those prophecies were literally fulfilled which were *not* literally fulfilled, he said that the Jews in the second century corrupted the texts in the Old Testament in order to invalidate the arguments drawn from them by Christians. He also wrote an 'Essay towards Restoring the True Text of the Old Testament,' in which he maintained that, in the time of Jesus and His Apostles, the Septuagint agreed with the Hebrew text, and then the passages quoted in the New Testament corresponded to the passages in the Old.

Says the Old Testament texts were corrupted by the Jews.

In the third century the Jews gave Origen a corrupted copy of the Septuagint, which he put into his 'Hexapla,' and which soon took the place of the authentic copy which the Christians had hitherto possessed. In the latter end of the fourth century the Jews gave the Christians a similarly corrupted copy of the Hebrew Bible; and as the Christians were till then universally ignorant of Hebrew, it was received eagerly as an invaluable treasure.

If Collins's object had been merely to oppose the revelation in the Scriptures, he might have been satisfied with Whiston's admission that we have no correct copy of the Bible. But he could not admit the credibility of such cor

This incredible.

ruptions as the Jews were supposed to have made, or that such a man as Origen could have been imposed on in the matter of a version of the Septuagint. He finds Whiston at length arguing that the ritual laws of Moses, and parts of the Old Testament history, were *typical* prophecies of Christ, but to be distinguished from others which were literal, though both were confirmations of Christianity. Collins says they are all typical, and proofs of Christianity only in the sense that the fulfilment of a typical or allegorical prophecy can be a proof.

Answers to Collins.

The 'Discourse on Free-thinking,' and, still more, that on the 'Grounds and Reason of the Christian Religion,' engaged the whole Church militant in controversy. Bishops and deans, country curates and dissenting preachers, formed a phalanx whose name was legion, whatever might be its strength. That much of it was weakness, is not to be marvelled at; but Collins had many able and formidable adversaries. His 'Essay on the Use of Reason' did not escape the notice of William Carroll, who had written against Locke on the same subject. Carroll's mind was typical of the minds of that numerous class who have always opposed the exercise of reason in matters belonging to religion, just as Locke represents those who believe in the reasonableness of Christianity. In a letter to Dr. Prat, of Trinity College, Dublin, he 'detected, confuted, and gradually deduced from the very basis of atheism, upon which they are bottomed, the dangerous errors in a late book.' These *errors* were the doctrine of necessity, the attributing extension or expansion to the Deity, supposing that mind and matter in the last analysis may be only one substance, and identifying the human reason with the Divine. The last, in Carroll's opinion, was the foundation-error. It supposed the reason of man to be trustworthy and capable of pronouncing judgment on the contents of a revelation. He called it an 'atheistical imagination, and the foundation of Socinianism, Deism, Atheism, 'The Reasonableness of Christianity,' 'Christianity not Mysterious,' and such books.' Dr. Gaskell, afterwards Bishop of Chester, made some remarks on Collins's tract in the third edition of his book on the Trinitarian controversy; but these were solely on the question,

CHAP. XI.

if the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity is capable of such rational explication as to be placed among the reasonable doctrines of Christianity.

Richard Bentley answers Collins.

Richard Bentley, the great critic, assailed the 'Discourse of Free-thinking' under the feigned name of *Phileutherus Lipsiensis*, in a letter to Dr. Francis Hare. It has been said of Bentley's performance that, as an answer, it was 'completely successful;' but to this high estimate was added the qualification that it was successful only by avoiding the question at issue.* Bentley had no quarrel with Collins about the right and duty of free-thinking when taken in that sense in which it is applied to Chillingworth, Taylor, and Tillotson. No religion, no sect—not, he said, the very Papists, deny it. This was a blunt method of ignoring a difference which is evident as the daylight. Bentley first assumed that Collins was the enemy of all righteousness—one of 'those atheists who, looking at their own actions, wish there were no God; and because they wish there were none, persuade themselves that there is none.' He then described the free-thinking of free-thinkers, not as honest thinking, but as 'bold, rash, arrogant presumptuousness, together with a strong propension to the paradox and the perverse.' It did not, perhaps, materially affect the argument that Bentley was a great scholar, a philologer by profession, and that Collins's scholarship did not rise above that of a man of extensive reading, who made literature the pleasure rather than the labour of his life. Some not very learned criticisms on the Bible, and one or two mistranslations of Cicero, Virgil, and Horace, gave Bentley the opportunity of saying that Collins's 'self-assurance supplied all want of abilities,' and that he interpreted 'the Prophets and Solomon without Hebrew, Plutarch and Zosimus without Greek, and Cicero and Lucan without Latin.' The mistakes which Collins made are so palpable that it did not require a Bentley to discover them. *Ingenium*, rendered by 'knowledge;' *terrores magicos*, by 'panic fears;' and *idiotis Evangelistis*, by 'idiot Evangelists,' were translations for which any schoolboy deserved a flogging. Taking advantage of mistakes like these, Bentley

* Mr. Pattison in 'Essays and Reviews.'

pronounced the whole discourse 'a uniform series of insincerity and ignorance, of juggle and blunder.'*

Francis Hare answers Collins.

Dr. Hare, to whom Bentley's letter was addressed, wrote a tract, which he called 'A Clergyman's Thanks to *Phileutherus Lipsiensis*.' He did not feign ignorance of the writer. Bentley, he said, may personate a foreigner, but no foreigner can personate Bentley. Hare had been Collins's tutor at King's College, in Cambridge, but he showed no more charity towards his former pupil than Bentley had done. The rational free-thinkers he called irrational and absurd atheists. It is not liberty for which they contend, but licentiousness—'an unbounded liberty to propagate their crude, absurd notions, which do not deserve the name of thoughts.' In this judgment of the free-thinkers, Benjamin Hoadly, Rector of St. Peter's Poor, agreed with Dr. Hare. He addresed 'Ten queries to the authors of the late Discourse,' in which he intimated that Collins manifested strong prejudices against the very foundation of all religion; that he had been unfair in representing it as the chief doctrine of the Gospel, that men were doomed to everlasting punishment for the sin of Adam; that he should not have spoken of the *fear* of God as something servile and terrifying; nor have given such an explication of the Trinity as he knew was not that of the New Testament writers. Many of Hoadly's remarks are very judicious, but there is an amount of resolute opposition to Collins which we could scarcely have expected from one who was afterwards to be known as the Socinian Bishop.

Dr. Williams answers Collins.

Dr. Daniel Williams, the founder of the Nonconformists' Library, wrote 'A Letter to the Author of a Discourse of Free-thinking, wherein the Christian religion is vindicated by detecting several abuses of Free-thinking.' Dr. Williams was a very orthodox Presbyterian divine. He considered it very wicked for people to dispute about the eternity of hell torments, for since God, in His word, has said they are eternal, then eternal punishment *must* consist with His perfections. Moreover, so long as there is

* Some of Collins's mistakes in mere matters of scholarship are certainly unaccountable. Throughout his books he spells Sibyl and Sibylline as 'Sybil' and 'Sybilline.' Surely no one who knows the Greek Σιβυλλα could possibly make this mistake.

CHAP. XI.

the bare possibility of such a thing, we ought, to keep the safe side, and to entertain such a belief of the Trinity and everlasting fire as shall 'make us well-pleasing in t' sight of God.'

John Addicombe.

John Addicombe, Doctor of Medicine, proved that the free-thinkers did not know the meaning of the name which they assumed. 'A Gentleman of Cambridge' *undeniably demonstrated* 'the absurdity and infidelity of the sect of the free-thinkers.' They were trying, he said, to root out all religion; and after proving that, from the nature of things, there must be *ghosts*, he pronounced Collins's tract worse than any heathen book.

Bishop Chandler on prophecy.

The 'Discourse on the Grounds and Reasons' had thirty-five answers within two years after its publication. The weightiest of these was written by 'The Right Reverend Father in God, Edward Lord Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield.' This was the learned Bishop Chandler, who, like all Collins's adversaries, affected to despise his abilities, yet thought his treatise required an elaborate reply. Chandler dedicated his book to the King; and, in the preface, congratulated his Majesty on having given 'a seasonable order in Council for suppressing those impious clubs that then used to meet on purpose to harden one another in sin.' The first argument for the truth of prophecy is drawn from the universal belief that prevailed in the world, that a great Deliverer was to come. The Greeks had it from the Sibylline oracles which they derived from the Jews, and the Romans had it from the Greeks. It was grounded on prophecies both direct and typical. The Jews always explained some prophecies as typical of the Messiah. Solomon, David, and Joshua, the High Priest, were regarded as figures of *Him who was to come.* There were many reasons why Old Testament prophecies should be obscure until they were fulfilled. A clear revelation concerning King Messias might have caused the neglect of the Mosaic institutions. It might have alarmed the princes and governors of the Jewish nation; and the Jews, who were to be the instruments of the Messiah's death, might have frustrated the fulfilment of the prophecies. The passages quoted by Matthew were rightly applied to Jesus in a typical sense. The Jews were

familiar with this mode of interpreting prophecy. Hence St. Paul addresses to them, as the *spiritual and perfect*, mystical reasonings which he did not address to the Gentiles. The interpretation which Jesus and His Apostles gave to the Old Testament Scriptures ought to be accepted by us, because of the miracles which Jesus wrought, and the fulfilment of events which He predicted, such as His resurrection and ascension, the rejection of the Jews, and the desolation of their country and temple. The world, at the time of Jesus, was waiting for the Messiah. The Jews were in daily expectation of the kingdom of God. They looked for redemption in Israel. It was the promise to which *the twelve tribes instantly serving God day and night* had desired to come. The scribes at once told Herod that Bethlehem was to be the place of the Messiah's birth. The Samaritans had the same hope as the Jews; they knew that *Messias cometh*. Since old Jacob had slept with his fathers, the twelve tribes had waited for Shiloh, and daily in their temple service they repeated the hopes so frequently expressed in the psalms concerning *One that was to come*. Wherever the Jews were scattered they carried this hope with them. The verses of the Roman Sibyl were often, indeed, used for political purposes. Julius Cæsar, about to go to war with the Parthians, wished to be called *king*, because it was written in the *Books of Fate* that the Parthians could not be subdued but by a king, and by 'a king only could we be saved.' Cicero, indeed, doubted if these were the words of the genuine sibyl, because the verse was an acrostic; but Chandler did not think this a sufficient reason to warrant Cicero's doubts. Lentulus, who joined the conspiracy of Catiline, applied the oracle to himself, expecting that the new empire was to find its accomplishment in him. Suetonius says that before the birth of Augustus it was commonly affirmed *that nature was then in labour to bring forth a king that should rule the Romans*, which Virgil explains in prophecies concerning one of the *race of the gods*.

Universal expectation of a Messiah among Jews,

And Gentiles.

'Hic vir, hic est tibi quem promitti sæpius audis
Augustus Cæsar, Divi genus; aurea condet
Secula qui rursus, Latio, regnata per arva
Saturno quondam.'—*Æn.* vi. 791.

CHAP. XI.

Virgil and the Messianic prophecies.

These hopes not being realized in Augustus, when h wife Scribonia was pregnant, Virgil wrote his fourth eclogue, in which he ascribed to the child that was to be born all the glorious things in the Sibylline verses concerning the great king that was to come. Scribonia's child was not a son, and Virgil lost credit as an interpreter of prophecy. The political applications of the prophecies were incorrect, but they show us what were the expectations of that age Virgil speaks of an age to come, called the *ultima ætas*, ' 'last age,'—

'Quo *ferrea* primum
Desinet, ac toto surget gens *aurea* mundo,'

which corresponds to the fifth kingdom of Daniel, which was to succeed the fourth, or *iron* kingdom, which 'breaketh in pieces and subdueth all things.' The glorious times d scribed by Isaiah are the same which Virgil describes whe he says,

'Omnis feret omnia tellus
Non rastros patietur humus, non vinea falcem.'

And again—

'To duce, si qua manent sceleris vestigia nostris
Irrita perpetuâ solvent formidine terras.'

Cicero and the Sibylline verses.

So great was the dread of the victorious king, that Cicero, thinking the religion and liberties of the commor wealth in danger, proposed to remove the Sibylline book into secret custody, to be opened only by an order of th Senate. Augustus was pleased to be considered this predicted king, and, fearing any rivals, he had all the Sibyllin verses carefully examined and treasured up in the Temple of Apollo. That these prophecies came from the Jews Chandler thinks is placed beyond doubt by a passage c Tacitus, beginning 'Pluribus persuasio inerat, *antiquis sacerdotum libris* contineri *eo ipso tempore* fore ut valesceret *Oriens*, profectique Judæa rerum potirentur;' and another in Suetonius, 'Percrebuerat orienti toto vetus ac constans opinio esse in fatis ut eo tempore Judæa profecti rerum potirentur;' with a similar passage in Josephus concerning the war under Vespasian.

This general expectation of the Messiah is traced back t the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. In the first book o

The Jewish longing for the Messiah.

Maccabees it was resolved to lay up the stones of the polluted altar till there should come a Prophet to answer about them. This could not be an ordinary prophet, for after Malachi no such prophet was to come till the return of Elijah. Again, it is said that Judas the Maccabee was appointed the Governor and High Priest for ever, *i.e.* him and his sons, until there should arise a faithful prophet. The Jews expected such a prophet as Moses, who was *faithful* in all his house. In Nehemiah's time the Messiah was looked for as the High Priest who was to come with the Urim and Thummim; and His coming was to be connected with the gathering together of the twelve tribes; of which there is frequent mention in the Apocryphal writings. The belief of this general expectation is confirmed by the liturgies and service-books of the ancient Jews. They had many such prayers as this quoted by Joseph Albo, 'O that Elias would come quickly with Messias the Son of David! Send to us the branch of David in our days. How long will He tarry? Let the memory of Messias the Son of David, Thy servant, come before Thee.'

Chandler's twelve Messianic prophecies.

Chandler was willing to test the question of literal fulfilment by twelve prophecies taken as specimens. He would select them from the later prophets, because they were the clearest and the most difficult to be evaded.

The messenger of the covenant.

1. Mal. iii. 1.—'Behold, I send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: and the Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to His temple, even the Messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in: behold, He shall come, saith the Lord of Hosts.'

This is one of the prophecies which Grotius gives up as not having a double sense, but as referring literally to Christ. There are two persons spoken of, both messengers—John the Baptist and Jesus. The messenger was a common name for the Messiah among the Jews.

The coming of Elijah.

2. Mal. iv. 5, 6.—'Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord. And he shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to the fathers, lest I come and smite the earth with a curse.'

This prophecy is a repetition of the former. Elijah was

CHAP. XI.

to come before the Messiah. Prophecy was sealed up w Malachi. There was to be no prophet till the coming ag of Elijah, which was to precede the destruction of the Je... as a nation. The Baptist spoke of 'One to come after h mightier than he, whose fan was in His hand, and who was to burn the chaff with unquenchable fire.'

The desire of nations.

3. Hag. ii. 6–9.—'For thus saith the Lord of Hosts; Yet once more, it is a little while, and I will shake the heavens and the earth, and the sea, and the dry land; and I will shake all nations, and the desire of all nations shall come: and I will fill this house with glory, saith the Lord. The silver is mine, and the gold is mine, saith the Lord of hosts. The glory of this latter house shall be greater than of the former, and in this place will I give peace, saith the Lord of hosts.'

It is true that the word *desire* is plural in Hebrew, which Chandler says is a Hebraism. It gives intenseness to the meaning. Besides, we could not speak of *desirable things* as coming. It is only of a person that we can predicate coming in an active sense. Peace is one of the names of the Messiah. The second temple was inferior to the first; yet its glory was greater, because of the presence of Him whose glory was as the *glory of the only begotten of the Father*. The second temple was to continue till the days of King Messiah.

4. Zech. ix. 9.—'Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Sion, shout, O daughter of Jerusalem. Behold thy King cometh unto thee, the righteous One and that Saviour, lowly riding upon an ass and upon a colt the foal of an ass.'

The Son of David.

This prophecy is twice expounded of the Messiah in the Talmud. The multitude knew of whom it was spoken when they cried, 'Hosanna to the Son of David.'

The Messiah a sufferer.

5. Zech. xii. 10.—'And I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplication; and they shall look on Him whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for Him as one mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for Him as one that is in bitterness for his firstborn.'

There is no other but Jesus to whom this prophecy can be applied. It corresponds to Ps. xxii., where David, pe

ɔnating the Messiah, says, '*They shall pierce my hands and my feet.*' And to the words of Isaiah, '*He was wounded for our transgressions and bruised for our iniquities.*'

6. Dan. ii. 44, 45.—'And in the days of these kings shall ıe God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed, and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these ingdoms, and it shall stand for ever. Forasmuch as thou west that the stone was cut out of the mountain without ands, and that it breaketh in pieces the iron, the brass, the ay, the silver, and the gold.' The great kingdom.

The Jews always understood by the *stone* the Messiah, and by the image the Roman empire. When the kingdom of the Seleucidæ, one of the two remaining branches of Daniel's third kingdom, was destroyed by Pompey, the Jews everywhere were in immediate expectation of their redemption. This was the origin of the rumour that nature was in pangs to bring forth a king. It was this which frightened the Roman Senate, and caused them to desire the strangling of every child, Augustus alone being permitted to live. This made Lentulus become the leader of the conspiracy under Catiline. We read in Lucan, that when the Greek empire fell, and Egypt became a Roman province, a Sibylline verse was found importing that the advent of a great king was near at hand. Josephus interpreted the fourth empire as the Roman, and that which was to follow as the kingdom of the *stone*.

7. Dan. vii. 13, 14.—'I saw in the night visions, and behold one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven and came to the ancient of days, and they brought Him near before him, and there was given Him dominion and glory and a kingdom that all people and nations should serve Him. His dominion is an everlasting dominion which shall not pass away, and His kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.' The Son of man.

This corresponds to the kingdom of *stone* in the former vision. The Jews earnestly maintain that Daniel's 'Son of man' was the Messiah.

8. Dan. ix. 24–27.—'Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people,' etc. The seventy weeks.

CHAP. XI.

Here is a plain promise of a Messiah, a Prince who was to come after sixty-nine weeks, who was to be judicially cut off at the end of or in the seventieth week. Soon after His death a Gentile army was to lay waste Jerusalem, when the daily sacrifice and the oblation of the temple were to cease.

The ruler in Israel.

9. Mic. v. 2.—'But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the princes of Judah, yet out of thee shall come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel, whose goings forth have been of old from everlasting.'

It is impossible to accommodate this prophecy to any other but to the Messiah. No one besides him has ever been thought of except Zerubbabel. But Zerubbabel was not born in Bethlehem; he never was ruler in Israel; nor were *his goings forth of old even from everlasting*. The old Jews always understood that Bethlehem was to be the birth-place of the Messiah. In one of the oldest of the Jewish prayers there is this petition, 'Shake thyself from the dust; arise, put on thy beautiful garments, O my people; by the hand of *Ben Jesse*, the Bethlehemite, bring redemption near to my soul.'

He that was to come.

10. Hab. ii. 3, 4.—'For the vision is yet for an appoint time, but at the end it (or he) shall speak and not lie. Though He tarry wait for Him.'

There was an age to come, and a Person who was to begin this age. This Person was spoken of as *He that cometh or that shall come*. Hence the words of the woman of Samaria, of Martha of Bethany, and of the Jews who sent to John the Baptist to ask if he were the *One* that was to come.

The rebuilding of the tabernacle of David.

11. Amos ix. 11, 12.—'In that day I will raise up the tabernacle of David which is fallen, and close up the breaches thereof; and I will raise up his ruins, and I will build it as in the days of old. That they may possess the remnant of Edom and of all the heathen which are called by my name, saith the Lord that doeth this.'

The tabernacle of David was a similitude for the kingdo of David. In its restitution the Gentiles were to have a part. This corresponds to many prophecies which speak of the calling of the Gentiles.

12. Isai. lii. 13; liii. 12.—'Behold, my servant shall deal prudently,' etc.

The righteous servant.

This is the last of the twelve prophecies. Chandler remarks that the Person here spoken of is one and the same from the beginning to the end, that a continual series of events is predicted of Him without reference to any other. He is the *servant* of God, *His righteous* servant. He was once the *desire* of the Jews, but in the afflicted condition in which he was to appear they were not to desire Him. He was a man of sorrow, and yet He was to prosper. His voluntary offering of Himself was to be expiatory of sin. He was to be a priest bearing iniquities, and yet a king exalted and extolled.

Prophecies typical and allegorical.

Chandler distinguishes between prophecies that are typical and prophecies that are allegorical. The latter are those the sense of which is not that of the prophet, but of the person applying the prophecies. They were in common use among the Jews. St. Paul's allegory of Sinai and Hagar is an instance. Typical prophecies may be used as proofs, for we may discern the intention of the writer or of God speaking in the person who personates the Messiah. In the early ages of the world it was common to speak by actions. Dionysius, the Thracian, has particularly noticed this custom among the Greeks. The Eastern people, especially the Jews, retained it longer than the others. Isaiah went naked and barefooted to represent the captivity of the Egyptians and Ethiopians by the King of Assyria. Ezekiel took a pot of iron and put it for a wall of iron between him and the city. The tabernacle was a type or figure by which the Holy Ghost signified a greater and more perfect tabernacle under the Messiah. The words of David concerning the greatness of Solomon, point to one yet greater than Solomon. David himself interpreted of the Messiah the words of older prophets, as when God spake in vision to His saints, saying, 'I have laid help upon One that is mighty.'

In regard to the passages of the New Testament quoted by Collins, to show that prophecy was not literal, Chandler answers that Matthew wrote for Jews, and may have used a method of interpreting prophecy to which the Jews were accustomed. The phrase *that it may be fulfilled,* is often used when a text has simply been accommodated by the writer. It is equivalent to the expression, *it is true,* or

CHAP. XI.

St. Matthew's quotations from the Old Testament, are merely accommodations.

herein is that saying true. An event darkly intimated now plainly illustrated, or a fact as truly answers the citation, as if the citation had been a prophecy of it. Jeremiah spoke of the lamentation of the Jewish mothers for the murder of their infants by the Assyrian army, and when Herod slew the babes of Bethlehem, the words of Jeremiah were again fulfilled. The tender mother, personated by Rachel, again caused her voice to be heard in *Rama,* or upon the high hills, which mourners were wont to ascend to proclaim their grief. *Out of Egypt have I called my son,* had been a kind of proverb since the children of Israel came out of Egypt. It suited Christ's case just as it suited any other parallel event. *He shall be called a Nazarene,* is not, indeed, in the Old Testament in words, but it is there in substance, and is implied in the proverb that no good thing could come out of Nazareth. The Evangelist had in his mind Isaiah's prophecy: 'There shall come a rod out of Jesse, and a branch (netzar) shall grow out of his roots.' As to the coming again of Elijah, there is nothing to show that more is intended than that the forerunner of Jesus should come in the spirit and power of Elias. *Their heart is waxed gross,* is *applied* by Jesus to the Jews of His day, who were a perverse and hypocritical people in the days of Isaiah. *Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings,* was not taken for a prophecy either by Christ or by the scribes. *Behold a virgin shall conceive,* whether understood typically or literally, was fulfilled in the birth of Jesus. Isaiah's son, though called Immanuel, was not born of *an undefiled virgin,* nor could the words *Wonderful, Counsellor, Everlasting Father,* be applied to him. Moreover, it could not have been any remarkable sign to the Jews, that a married woman should have a son. That the Messiah was to be a virgin's son was a general belief. Hence Simon Magus gave out that his mother Rachel was a virgin. Domitian, flattered even by the Jews with the title of Messiah, proclaimed himself the son of Minerva, born without a father; and so Virgil calls the child that was to be born of Scribonia *the great offspring of Jupiter.*

'The Literal Accomplishment of Scripture Prophecy' was written by William Whiston. Whiston was under some

obligation to reply to Collins, for a great part of the 'Literal Scheme' was devoted to his 'Essay on the Restoration of the True Text of the Old Testament.' He now showed, by restoring the original readings of the Old Testament from the Septuagint, the Samaritan Pentateuch, the Roman Psalter, and the Apostolical Constitutions, that all the prophecies quoted in the New Testament concerning Jesus are literal fulfilments, without any sign of a double sense, typical interpretation, or previous application to any other person. As to Jesus' description of the Jews from Isaiah, it might be applicable to the Jews both of the time of Isaiah and of Jesus. Yet all such descriptions in the Old Testament properly belong to the days of the Messiah. Whiston showed that very many of the prophecies of Daniel had been literally fulfilled, though some were still future, and that in the New Testament there are many predictions which he knew to have been accomplished. He was looking out for the dawn of the Millennium, and interpreted from St. Barnabas Haggai's *desire of nations* as the Messiah, whose coming was to be followed by the destruction of the temple in the time of the Romans, and the final restoration of the Jews in the seventh Millenary of the world. That we are living in the last times is evident, he said, from the invention of the art of printing, the great knowledge in natural philosophy reached by Sir Isaac Newton and Robert Boyle, the institution of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, and that for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts, the discovery of the Samaritan Pentateuch, the Apostolical Constitutions, the Epistles of Clement, Barnabas, Ignatius, and Polycarp,—and above all, an old copy of the Sibylline oracles. That the scoffers of the last days had come is evident from the publication of Collins's 'Discourse of Freethinking,' Cato's letters in the *London Journal*, and John Toland's pamphlets. The great foundation of unbelief in modern times Whiston held to be the reception of the Masoretic Bible.

Whiston restores the true text of the prophecies.

A more rational reply to Collins was that of Samuel Clarke, who wrote 'A Discourse concerning the connection of the Prophecies in the Old Testament and their application to Christ.' Clarke understood Collins to affirm that the Old

Samuel Clarke on prophecy.

CHAP. XI.

Testament prophecies in no way referred to Christ: th they were entirely fulfilled in other persons or events, a that there was no foundation for their application to the Messiah or His kingdom. It is not evident that Collins stated his case so strongly as this; but Clarke's answer is, that the Jews had not a clear and distinct understanding even of the express prophecies, much less of those which were obscure and indistinct. They were only intended be a light in a dark place. Yet it is evident that these pr phecies, indistinct as they were, created in the Jewish mind a general expectation of a Messiah. Jesus showed Himself by His mighty works to be the Son of God. The prophecies are never urged as proofs; they have not, Clarke says, any thing in themselves of the nature of direct or positive proof It is enough to show that there was wanting no circumstance, no *sine quâ non*, no character appropriated by any the ancient prophets to the promised Messiah. They are n applied allegorically, much less can the reasoning be calle allegorical. 'Ought not Christ to have suffered these things' is not urged to prove that Jesus was the Messiah, but to answer the objections of those who did not know that throug suffering He was to come into His kingdom. Though n positive proofs, the Messianic prophecies are confirmation of the fore-knowledge of God, and of the uniform design of Providence under different dispensations. Clarke cal special attention to the literal fulfilment of the prophecie concerning Babylon, Egypt, and Tyre; but he grants t Collins that some of the quotations in the New Testamen are mere allusions, as 'the voice heard in Rama,' an 'surely He hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows,' applied to Jesus healing the sick.

Arthur Ashley Sykes on the Christian religion.

A still more rational Christian than even Samuel Clarke was Arthur Ashley Sykes, rector of Rayleigh, in Essex, who wrote 'An Essay on the Truth of the Christian Religion,' with special reference to prophecy. He begged of the adversaries of Christianity to read the New Testament book with the same equity and candour that they did Greek and Roman authors. He admitted what Collins so strongly contended for, that the miracles of Jesus would not prove His Messiahship, if He appealed for proofs to the Old Testa-

ment prophecies and these prophecies did not refer to Him. The whole question, then, was, if these prophecies referred to Him at all in any sense. Collins said they were mere 'accommodations' made by 'artful and learned men.' Sykes said no, but rather 'the observation of things has pointed out what it is that was foretold.' But we cannot argue from types, we cannot use them as proofs, for that word in the New Testament signifies nothing more than similarity. We cannot prove to a gainsayer that the rites and ceremonies of the Mosaic law were designed prefigurations. The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews does not use the types as arguments, but only as illustrations. Many passages applied in the New Testament to Jesus plainly relate to other persons, and did not refer to Jesus even in a secondary sense. Such as 'A virgin shall conceive,' John the Baptist being compared to Elias, 'Surely He hath borne our griefs,' and the application of Psalm xix. to the first preachers of the Gospel, which is no more than if the Evangelist had addressed them in the words of Virgil: '*Vos clarissima mundi lumina.*' The words of Isaiah, quoted by Matthew, concerning the birth of Jesus, is merely the citation of words agreeable to the event, and not a prophecy of it. Bishop Kidder had come to the same conclusion after a long consideration of the subject. Le Clerc says that the Jews used to speak of a passage of Scripture as fulfilled, if anything happened to which it could be applied. Ælian mentions a similar mode of speaking, from which we learn that it was not unknown to heathen writers. Diogenes Sinopensis used continually to say of himself that *he fulfilled and underwent* all the curses of tragedy. 'This is He that was spoken of by the prophet Esaias,' is paralleled by a passage in Plato's 'Alcibiades.' Socrates throws out a conjecture that some time or another One would come into the world who should teach mankind how to behave themselves towards God and man. Alcibiades asks when that time will be, and who He is who is thus to instruct mankind? Socrates answers, 'It is He who now takes care of you;' and soon after that 'He has a wonderful concern for you.' Alcibiades declares his readiness to wait for that time, and expresses a hope that it may come soon. 'Now,'

Bishop Kidder gives up Isaiah vii. 14.

CHAP. XI.

Sykes continues, 'should any one say when Jesus appeared and did, in fact, what Socrates said, "This is He that was spoken of by Socrates," the common use of language in all countries would bear him out and justify the expression; much more would the particular idiom of the Jews, whose way of citing their sacred books is known to be exactly in this manner.' Sykes, however, finds many literal prophecies in the Scriptures, and notably that of Isaiah liii., which is applied only to the Messiah. There is, he says, no one thing which has made the New Testament the subject of ridicule to Jews and infidels so much as the obscure inferences which Christians usually draw from passages which visibly contain not one tittle of what is pretended. And he concludes with these remarkable words:—'Would to God that Christians would be content with the plainness and simplicity of the Gospel! That they would be persuaded to make no other terms of communion than what Jesus Himself has made! That they would not vend, under the name of Evangelical truth, the absurd and contradictory schemes of ignorant and wicked men! That they would look upon all serious Christians as members of the one body of Christ! That they would cease from unchristian damning, persecuting, and burning each other for not assenting to the words of men as the words of God! And Christianity would soon become the joy of the whole earth, and infidelity would lose its main—I may say, its only support.'

Sykes recommends moderation.

Thomas Sherlock on prophecy.

Thomas Sherlock, Master of the Temple, and afterwards Bishop of London, published six discourses on 'The Use and Intent of Prophecy in the several Ages of the World.' The discourses were originally delivered in the Temple Church. Sherlock understood Collins to say that the argument from prophecy, though a very bad one, was the best that could be produced for Christianity, and that this was affirmed by St. Peter where he speaks of the sure word of prophecy. To which Sherlock replied, that though interpreters differed very much in explaining the words of St. Peter, yet all were agreed in rejecting the sense which gives a superiority to the evidence of prophecy above all other evidence. It was only a *light in a dark place*, to be

attended till the *day dawn*. The author of prophecy Himself described it thus:—'I have multiplied visions and used similitudes by the ministry of the prophets;' and elsewhere it is spoken of as dark speeches delivered to the saints in *visions* and *dreams*. The most literal prophecies have received the greatest confirmation and the most light from the events. The evidence is not to be sought in the application of single prophecies to Christ, but in a general view and comparison of them all put together. Jesus of Nazareth gave the fullest evidence of His divine commission by His mighty works, but He also claimed to be the person foretold in the law and the prophets. Is there enough to justify His claim? The argument from prophecy is not;—all the ancient prophecies have expressly pointed out and characterized Christ, but all the notices which God gave to the fathers of His intended salvation are perfectly answered by the coming of Christ.

Samuel Chandler and Dr. Lobb on prophecy.

Samuel Chandler, a Dissenting minister, maintained, in opposition to Collins, that Christianity had other grounds than the prophecies of the Old Testament. Theophilus Lobb, Doctor of Medicine, wrote 'A Brief Defence of the Christian Religion,' which was *very* orthodox. Brampton Gardon, Archdeacon of Sudbury, defended the Christian religion by the prophecies of the Old Testament. The Archdeacon had been Boyle Lecturer, and had taken prophecy for his subject. He was disappointed that none of the disputants on either side took any notice of his Boyle Lectures, and so he wrote a treatise to call attention to what he had said in them. John Green wrote 'Letters' to Collins, in which he maintained that Isaiah's 'virgin' was the Virgin Mary and no other; and as Matthew was inspired, he could not have mistaken the sense of the prophecies which he applied to Jesus. Moreover, he declared that Bishop Chandler interpreted the prophecies as if they were not much better than cunningly-devised fables. Orthodoxy and simplicity are often united, as they were in John Green.

Collins' 'Literal Scheme.'

When Collins replied to his numerous antagonists, he felt that it was really with Bishop Chandler that he had to deal. The rest might be left to refute each other; and if he

CHAP. XI.

could get a victory over the great champion of prophecy, the might be tied to the chariot-wheels to grace the triumph Sykes, Clarke, and Sherlock had answered skilfully. By their large admissions, and by their maintaining that prophecy was a proof of Christianity only in a limited sense. they came near to Collins, and at the same time deprive him of what seemed to be his strongest points. Chandler indeed, had gone a long way with them; but, partly from the thoroughness with which he went into the subject, and partly from a desire to be as orthodox as possible, he presented a broader side for attack. Collins wrote a review of the controversy, which he called 'The Literal Scheme of Prophecy Considered.' He denied emphatically that he ever meant it to be inferred that the foundation of Christianity was chimerical. He admitted that there was a expectation of a Messiah about the time of Christ, but it had its rise not long before that time, and was not so universal as some supposed. The *iron* in Nebuchadnezzar's image had no relation to the iron age of the poets. Virgil proceeded on the common theological idea of the ancients, that there were four ages,—the golden, the silver the brazen, and the iron; and now that the iron age had come, the cycle would begin again. The *Ultima Ætas* then was not, as the Bishop said, the glorious times of the Messiah, but the iron age of the Roman empire. That the 'prophet' of the Maccabees was an ordinary prophet, Collins brought forward, in evidence, Justin Martyr, who reasoned against the Jews that their prophets never ceased till Jesus was born, though, after Malachi, they were deemed prophets of a lower degree. But the great question between Chandler and Collins was *literal prophecy*. This is to be tried by the twelve prophecies quoted by the Bishop. As to the *first*, Collins says he is not reduced to the alternative of naming the person to whom an obscure prophecy refers, or admitting that it is a literal prophecy of the Messiah. The Messenger promised in this prophecy was to be the proprietor of the temple, to preside there, and to purify the sons of Levi; but Jesus came to put an end to the temple and the priesthood—to destroy the idea of the necessity of such things. In the *second*, the Bishop does

Chandler's twelve Messianic prophecies considered.

not prove that Elijah in Malachi means John the Baptist. Conformity of doctrine or manner is no proof of identity of person. But how is it a *literal* prophecy if by Elijah is meant John the Baptist? The Septuagint reads Elijah the Tishbite. When John was asked if he was that prophet, he said No, and rather identified himself with *the voice crying in the wilderness*, in Isaiah. In the *third*, the Bishop forgets that he is proving a Messiah from the Old Testament against adversaries who are not obliged to show that any prophecy was fulfilled. It is far from being evident that *the desire of all nations* is a person. The *fourth* prophecy is referred by Grotius and Sykes to Zerubbabel. *Having salvation*, as in the English version, is not correct; neither is *a Saviour*, which is the reading of the Vulgate. The Hebrew is passive, *saved*. It refers to one that was saved during the captivity. It proves nothing in the *fifth* prophecy, that we know of no one in history to whom it can be referred. It manifestly does not concern Jesus. There was to be war in Judea, and a siege in Jerusalem; and after that a deliverer of the Jews by a destruction of all nations. The contrary of all this happened at the death of Jesus, as Sykes had shown. Jerusalem was destroyed, but all nations were not destroyed. The Jews had not the spirit of grace and supplication, but were hardened. Instead of mourning for Him whom they had pierced, they curse Him to this day. The *sixth* is from Daniel, the authenticity of which book Collins does not admit. The *seventh* is also from Daniel. By the *Son of man* Collins maintains that the writer meant the Roman power. It was a great compliment to the Romans, to whom the Jews were under many obligations, to represent them by a symbol so much higher than the images of the former kingdoms. This is Grotius's interpretation. In the *eighth*, the Messias Prince that was to come after seven weeks, or forty-nine years, was Cyrus. At the end of sixty-two weeks, or four hundred and thirty-four years, was to come another Messias Prince, Judas Maccabæus, and before that time the city and wall were to be restored. At this time the Messias priest Onias is to be cut off, when the army of Antiochus Epiphanes was to destroy the city and sanctuary. He was to cause the Jewish worship to cease,

'Son of man' the Roman empire.

CHAP. XI.

and to set up the idols of the desolator. The Jews we again to recover their civil and religious liberty. All th is simple history which took place in the four hundred an ninety years between the fourth of Jehoiakim and the tim of Judas Maccabæus. The *ninth* is referred by Grotius Zerubbabel. *Goings forth of old even from everlasting* ref to his being descended from an illustrious house. Mec thinks this is a prophecy not yet fulfilled, and if s it cannot be of much service to the Bishop as a proc of literal fulfilment. The *tenth* is referred by Grotius Cyrus, who was to restore the Jews from captivity. It an exhortation to patience. Upon the *eleventh* Grotius say 'that God will raise up the kingdom of David in Zerub babel as in the days of old, and that the Jews shall be s powerful as to possess the remnant of Edom;' which, Col lins says, was certainly never fulfilled in the time of Jesus As to the *twelfth*, a great part of the words is literall applicable to Jeremiah, to whom Grotius applies the whol prophecy. After going through the twelve literal prophe cies, Collins says that there is not one which is not given u by some eminent Christian commentator. Grotius gives u almost all, and the illustrious Dodwell, who was the orna ment of the High Church party, maintained that the Chris tian world never would have discovered the meaning of th Old Testament prophecies but for the gift of the *baptisma* spirit. After an examination of Whiston's literal prophe cies, Collins challenges him to produce one so clear as tha in Seneca, the tragedian, of the discovery of America an Greenland,—

Zerubbabel 'the ruler in Israel.'

'Venient annis
Secula seris, quibus oceanus
Vincula rerum laxet et ingens
Pateat tellus, Tiphysque novos
Detegat orbes, nec sit terris
Ultima Thule.' *

Bishop Chandler wrote a *vindication* of his *defence;* but the subject narrowed to the question of the authenticity of the Book of Daniel and the meaning of Daniel's prophecies.

* It is remarkable that in this controversy no one mentioned the *Messianic* prophecy in the 'Prometheus' of Æschylus. 'Of wretched mortals he took no account, but designed after having annihilated the whole race, to plant a new kind in their place. No one opposed these purposes except me; but I had courage for the task, and saved mortals from descending to hell by a violent destruction. It is therefore that I am bowed beneath these sufferings, which are painful to endure and melancholy to be seen.'

Samuel Chandler also wrote again; so did Thomas Bullock, Rector of North Creek, in Norfolk, who had published a sermon on Collins's book on prophecy. Thomas Jeffrey, a preacher among the Dissenters, and other writers, published volumes of more or less value, but none of them contributed anything new to the main argument. Samuel Chandler admitted that the subject required a thorough examination, and did not seem to regret, after all, that it had been so freely handled.

Collins's sincerity.

It was natural that one who had so many adversaries as Collins would have some who abused him and refused him credit for either learning, ability, or common honesty. His frequent use of such phrases as 'our blessed Saviour,' 'our holy religion,' and the 'ever-blessed Trinity,' was very offensive, if he had ceased to be a believer in revelation. But it is not evident that he really was a positive unbeliever. He seems rather to have been a sceptic, a sincere doubter, who found difficulties in the way of believing Christianity as it was then popularly understood, which difficulties he could not overcome. Collins's intellect was as cold as it was clear, but it was thoroughly honest. To examine freely and to judge fairly was his religion. The true end, he said, which a man ought to have in view is happiness during the extent of his being, happiness in this world and in the world to come. The means to attain such happiness is by endeavouring to know and obey the will of God. He was a professed member of the Church of England, and regularly attended the celebration of the great Christian rite—the commemoration of the Last Supper of Jesus with His disciples. As a magistrate he bore a high character. His worst enemies, it is said, could never charge him with any vice or immorality. He is described as 'amiable, prudent, virtuous, and humane in all domestic duties and relations; of a benevolence towards all men worthy of the character of the citizen of the world.' When he was dying, he said he was persuaded that he was going to that place which God had prepared for them that love Him, and that the Catholic religion was to love God and man. It is mentioned in the 'Autobiography of Alexander Carlyle,' that one who knew Collins well once said that if

CHAP. XI.

he was not saved in the ship he would certainly get as on a plank.

Thomas Woolston.

Among the many replies that were made to Colli 'Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion,' there one by Thomas Woolston, called 'The Moderator betw an Infidel and an Apostate.' 'The Infidel' was Coll and 'the Apostate' the Protestant Church of England. 'Moderator' found that the great error on both sides wa departing from the doctrine of the Primitive Church, as have it in the writings of the Fathers. Woolston wa fellow of Sidney-Sussex College in Cambridge, and already become notorious by his devotion to patristical lea ing and his hatred of the clergy.

On the fulness of time.

In 1702 he had delivered a discourse in St. Mary's Chur Cambridge, in which he undertook to demonstrate by reas against the objections of the old Gentiles and of mode unbelievers, that the time in which Christ was manifested the flesh was the most proper time in the history of t world for such a manifestation. This discourse was much admired as an able defence of Christianity. There are in it no traces of any want of sincerity, and the arguments are such as might have been expected from a theologian of unsuspected orthodoxy. It was not published till twenty years afterwards, and the object of its publication then was to show that the author was still not only a Christian but a defender of Christianity.

'The Old Apology for Christianity Revived.'

In 1705 Woolston published the book which first distinctly indicated the peculiar bent of his mind. This was called 'The Old Apology for Christianity Revived.' It was written temperately and earnestly. The argument was an application of typology as proof. The whole of the Old Testament history was regarded as typical of Christ and the Christian Church. Moses was hid three months from Pharaoh, so was Jesus to be hid from Herod. The people of Israel obeyed Moses, their ruler, whom God had placed over them; so the first apologists of Christianity presented their apologies to the Roman Emperors. The darkness in Egypt foreshadowed the darkness of the Pagan world; and the plague of hail was the type of the rain and tempest that followed the prayers of the thundering legion. To convert

these fanciful analogies into proofs of the truth of Christianity was extravagant, but no one was offended with an author who pleased himself with allegories which owed their origin to the pious ingenuity of the Fathers of the Church.

Woolston got into trouble with the authorities of his college, and was deprived of his fellowship. From this time the two passions which possessed his mind—love of the Fathers and hatred of the Protestant clergy—began to intensify. Under the fictitious name of 'Aristobulus' he wrote letters to Dr. Bennet, of Cripplegate, announcing that he had come to England as a foreigner, and, after long study of all the different sects of English Christians, he had reached the conclusion that only among the Quakers could there be found any traces of Primitive Christianity. The ostensible object was to exalt the Quakers, the real object to abuse the clergy. He answered his own letters under the name of 'A Country Curate,' but the answers had the same object as the letters. He also wrote in Latin a dissertation concerning Pontius Pilate, in which he wished to prove that Pilate wrote to Tiberius an account of the life and works of Jesus, but that the letter preserved in the writings of the Fathers is not genuine. He wrote also to Drs. Whitby, Waterland, and Whiston concerning the orthodox faith, and the true interpretation of the Scriptures, reproaching these great divines with pretending to follow the Fathers, and yet departing widely from them. In all these writings Woolston had before him his two favourite objects,—abuse of the clergy and the restoration of the patristic interpretation of the Scriptures.

'Aristobulus.'

Just before his appearance in the Collins controversy Woolston had published a series of pamphlets, called 'Free Gifts to the Clergy, or the hireling Priests of what denomination soever.' He challenged them to a disputation, in which he was to prove that the hireling preachers of this age were the worshippers of the apocryphal beast and ministers of Antichrist, a subject, he said, very fit to be debated in these later times of the apostasy, in which,

'Free Gifts to the Clergy.'

> 'Fugere pudor, verumque, fidesque,
> In quorum subiêre locum fraudesque dolique,
> Insidiæ et vis et amor sceleratus habendi.'

CHAP. XI.

The one proof of the apostasy was that the modern preachers interpret the Scriptures literally, and not in the allegorical manner of the Fathers. The Church was now Babylonish and miserably bewildered. Literal interpretation was the cause of all heresy and infidelity. Origen had well said that those who literally expounded the law of Moses are preachers of vanity and lies, 'idiots or blockheads (*idiotas*) who understood not the typology and imagery of Scripture.' But those who know the deeper sense of the law are 'kings and princes and priests unto God. They have the key of knowledge. They remove the earth of the letter and draw forth living water.' Woolston said that he was the divine instrument to restore *the Gospel that had been hid for ages and generations*. He was the only man in the world that understood patristic learning, and he was sent in these latter days to turn the hearts of this generation to the understanding of the Fathers." By their authority he was to show the clergy the whole history of the Church from opened parables and enigmas of prophecy; and, after bringing them out of darkness, to put them on the straight path to the city of the *New Jerusalem*. When Origen wrote against Celsus, he was pleased to say of Woolston that he of all men was best skilled in the spirit of prophecy. Lactantius says that the way to divine knowledge is not by disputation, but by divination; and in this, venerable antiquity agreed with him. 'There is no man like me,' said Woolston, 'at divination and the interpretation of dreams, and at the music of the *evangelical harp*, and at singing the new song of the gospel upon the *old law*. The hireling clergy are but vain babblers, and it would be better for the people if, instead of listening to their sermons on Sunday, they were to be entertained with a *bear* and a *fiddle*, a *tumbler* and a *rope-dancer*.' Elijah derided the priests of Baal, and why should not he, who was sent to found 'the sect of Ænigmatists, or *harpers, harping on their harps*, not deride the priests of the latter-day apostasy?'

Woolston scarcely sane.

It is time to say that Woolston was not sound in his intellect. He speaks of this himself, and beseeches God to continue him in that state of reason to which he was restored. In one of the *Free Gifts to the Clergy* he says that

he was carried up in a lucid vision, like as in a chariot of fire, to the highest mountain of the law and the prophets, on which is situated that Paradise of God spoken of by St. John, St. Chrysostom, St. Jerome, and other ancient Fathers. Here he met Elias feeding, as St. Augustine saith, on the choice fruits of the tree of life, deep in the study of the Fathers, and writing a spiritual exposition of the law in confutation of Antichrist, previous to his coming to destroy the ministry of the letter, and to restore all men to the right understanding of the Fathers. Elias had a library on the Paradisiacal mount, about as good as the library at Sion College, where Woolston was daily employed in the same studies as Elias. The prophet was very expert at the Fathers, and explained many enigmatical things, especially what concerned the holy vestments of the priests. Woolston was very anxious to know who were the two witnesses in the Apocalypse. He had searched all the writings of the ancient Church authors to get their opinions, for 'the universal consent of antiquity is a great confirmation of one's own views.' Some said Moses and Elias, some Enoch and Elias, some Elias and Jeremiah, and others the two Testaments. Woolston asked Elias, who reminded him that the Fathers, though very singular *harpers* upon the law, were sometimes out of tune. Elias then sounded a trumpet through the *long street*, called Spiritual Israel, where the two witnesses lay dead. He summoned all the Fathers and Apostles to settle the question. After a long discussion they came to agree, with St. Augustine, that the two witnesses were Moses and Elias, Enoch and Elias, and also the two Testaments, and they passed a resolution *not to depart from any of the ancient opinions about the two witnesses, but to hold them all as true*, for they all had the sanction of a *venerable antiquity*.

His object.

It may be concluded fairly that by this time Woolston's faith in Catholic antiquity had failed him. He proposed to Collins to make a collection of the ridiculous opinions that have the sanction of the Primitive Church, and through them to bring contempt both on the Fathers and the modern clergy. This proposal is perhaps the best key to all his subsequent writings. In the 'Moderator' he laments the

CHAP. XI.

growth of infidelity, and, starting with Collins's difficulti about the fulfilment of prophecy, undertakes to help the Christian side by showing the allegorical fulfilments.

Allegorical interpretations.

It was not denied that Jesus expressly said He had come to fulfil the law and the prophets. The ancient Jews considered them typical of the Messiah, so did the Apostles and Fathers. No other argument for Christianity can be valid till this of prophecy is settled. Augustine and Theophylact say that the five books of Moses were a treatise of Christ and His Church under types and figures. The Jews said that every word, yea, every letter of the law, had in it something mysterious, which would receive illumination in the days of the Messiah. Many of those who replied to Collins appealed to the miracles as an additional argument for the truth of Christianity, but the appeal to miracles could not be made if Jesus were not the person He professed to be—the promised Messiah of the Jews. False Christs were to do miracles, so that miracles could not establish His mission. And, moreover, the miracles of Jesus are scarcely credible. St. Augustine said that if some of ther were not figurative they were foolish. Woolston maintaine they were all figurative, not works actually wrought, but prophetical or parabolical narrations of what Christ wou do wondrously and mysteriously in His Church. This w the subject of his last book, 'The Discourses on th Miracles,' in which his hatred to the clergy and his love of the Fathers reached their climax. 'I shall not,' he says, 'deliver my own opinions, but the opinions of the Fathers, for I, so unlike am I to the rest of mankind, have no opinion but what I have taken from them. And all the honour and happiness I pretend to is to defend and illustrate their opinions against all the opposition of Jews, infidels, and apostates.'

'Discourses on the Miracles.'

'The Discourses on the Miracles' were properly an extension of 'The Moderator.' The first was dedicated to Edmund Gibson, Bishop of London. It is admitted that Jesus appeals to His works as proof of His Messiahship, but the works to which He appealed were those done in the spirit, not in the flesh, just as in the case of prophecy H did not appeal to literal but to figurative prediction

Eucherius laid down this principle, that the Scriptures of the New as well as the Old Testament are to be interpreted in an allegorical sense. This was a common opinion in the primitive ages. As the writings of the Evangelists are not excepted, the miracles are included. Origen says that what Jesus did in the flesh was but typical or symbolical of what He would do in the Spirit. The bodily diseases were figures of the infirmities of the soul. St. John of Jerusalem said that the cures performed by Jesus were great, yet unless He do mighty works daily in His Church we should forbear our admiration of Him. St. Augustine said, that considering the almighty power and goodness of Jesus, He did nothing great, and that such works as He did might be done by magical acts. He said, also, that Antichrist would imitate and equal all the miracles wrought by Jesus. Apollonius Tyanæus, Vespasian, and the Irish Greatrakes performed as miraculous cures as those ascribed to Jesus; but they were not sufficient to entitle them to be considered prophets, or to claim to found new religions. Origen says that in the historical parts of Scripture there are things inserted as history which were never transacted, and which it was impossible should be transacted; and St. Hilary says that there is a necessity for mystical interpretation, for many parts of the New Testament, if taken literally, are contrary to sense and reason.

Casting the traders out of the temple only a parable.

To apply this to the miracles. First, there is the most stupendous of all miracles, Jesus casting the traders out of the temple. Origen says the whole story is only a parable. If Jesus had attempted such a thing, the merchants would have reproached him with damaging their property. He would, besides, be amenable to the public authorities for raising a riot in the temple, when He had neither right nor power to interfere with the buyers and sellers. The temple means the Christian Church. Those who sold are those who make merchandise of the gospel. St. Hilary is of the same opinion as Origen. He says there was no such market kept in the temple of Jerusalem. The seats of those who sold doves were the pulpits of those who sell the Holy Ghost, that is doves. Its real meaning is some future ejection of hireling clergy out of the Church. St. Jerome says

CHAP. XI.

there are absurdities in the letter, but Jesus will yet enter His temple, and with a mysterious whip, made out of Scripture texts, He will cast out the bishops, priests, and deacons who make a trade of preaching. Augustine also interprets it of the clergy who make the Church a *den of thieves*.

The demoniacs of Gadara.

As to the miracle of the Demoniacs of Gadara, there are many circumstances that would induce us to call in question the whole of the story. It is not credible that there was any herd of swine in that country. The Jews were forbidden to eat swine's flesh. There was nothing beneficent in the miracle, but the contrary. It was a great loss to the owners of the swine. St. Hilary justly says that it is typical. The madmen are mankind. There are two of them—the Jew and the Gentile. They are possessed by devils, that is, they are subject to diabolical lusts, and are given up to the worship of demons. They are naked, which shows that they are destitute of grace. The devils were cast out of Jew and Gentile, and suffered to go into a herd of swine, that is, the heretics. Woolston thinks the heretics meant are the clergy of the present day, who believe in the letter of the Scriptures, which, in the mystical language of the Fathers, is compared to the husks that the swine did eat. Had the owners of the swine been present when Pilate asked, 'What evil hath He done?' they would have found a ready answer.

The transfiguration.

The transfiguration on the mount Woolston calls, 'the darkest and blindest story of the whole gospel.' Jesus was *metamorphosed*. His form was changed. The word is generally used of a transformation of shape or essence. Moses and Elias talked with Him about the book of Exodus, and how He should fulfil it in the New Jerusalem. It prefigures some future transfiguration which is to take place, as St. Hilary says, after six ages of the world, which are the six days of the text. Moses and Elias, according to Origen, mean the law and the prophets bearing an allegorical testimony to Jesus as the fulfiller of them. By the mountain Origen understood the sublime and allegorical sense of the Scriptures. By the black cloud some of the Fathers understood the letter of the Old Testament, and by the white vestments of Jesus the words of the Scriptures, which will

then shine clear and bright. We shall never see Jesus in His white vestments, said St. John of Jerusalem, so long as we follow the letter.

The woman with the issue of blood.

These three miracles occupy Woolston's first discourse. The second, dedicated to Edward Chandler, Bishop of Lichfield, is devoted to the consideration of the cure of the woman who had the issue of blood, the woman who had a spirit of infirmity eighteen years, and the conversation with the woman of Samaria. We are in ignorance of the nature of the issue of blood. It could not have been very grievous, for the woman subsisted too long under it, and bore it too well. St. John of Jerusalem says that it was her own imagination which cured her. St. Ambrose says that the issue of blood was the corruption aud impurity of the Church, and the twelve years the 1200 years during which it was to continue. This may correspond to the 1200 days of the woman in the wilderness, which Protestants take to be a prophecy of the apostasy of the universal Church. Now that the 1200 years are passed, it is time that the woman were cured. The Fathers are generally agreed that the physicians are the clergy, on whom the poor afflicted woman has spent all her living in fees, stipends, and gratuities, and instead of getting better she is growing worse. The Church for ages has been declining in morals and principles. God in His own time must give her medicine, for if she is left to the physicians her issue will continue to flow.

The woman with the spirit of infirmity.

The woman with the spirit of infirmity may have had comfortable words addressed to her by Jesus, but after the devil is taken out of this story there is nothing more in it. The woman is the Church, as Augustine, Ambrose, and all the great Fathers have shown. She is *bowed down with a spirit of infirmity*, that is, she is bent on interpreting the Scriptures literally. Augustine says, that after 1800 years she is to be healed of this infirmity. It is said that the ruler was moved with indignation, which cannot possibly be true. Human nature is incapable of such resentment. Works of charity and mercy were allowed on the Sabbath day by the law of Moses. The woman being bound by Satan shows the fanatical and persecuting spirit which keeps her infirm. This is all that is meant by Satan, the Dragon,

CHAP. XI.

and the Devil. This persecuting spirit is itself to be bound for a thousand years; the chains that are to bind it are the strong fetters of reason and Christian freedom.

The woman of Samaria.

At the well of Samaria Jesus is represented as appearing in the character of a fortune-teller. He divined all the woman's history and her present character. The other Samaritans came out and got their fortunes told. Probably they expected this would be the mark of the Messiah. The literal story is altogether silly. The Fathers say that the woman is a heretical and adulterous Church, which Jesus, long wearied with her corrupt state, will meet in the sixth age of the world. He will meet her at the well of the Holy Scriptures, whose sense lies deep. He will make her drink of the spiritual meaning, after drinking which she will never be thirsty again. She had five husbands, which mean five senses, and also that she was wedded to the literal sense of the five books of Moses. When the Church has revealed to her the mystical sense, then the disciples will marvel that Jesus talks with the woman.

The cursing of the fig-tree.

The third discourse is dedicated to Richard Smalbroke Bishop of St. David's. It treats of the cursing of the fig-tree, and healing the lame man at the pool of Bethesda. Augustine said that if cursing the fig-tree is not a figure, it was a very foolish act. The time of figs was not yet which made it very unreasonable to look for figs, as unreasonable as if a Kent yeoman were to look for pippins at Easter. But whose fig-tree was it? Jesus could have nc right over it. He owned nothing. Among all the relics preserved by the Church of Rome there is not so much as a *three-footed stool* or a pair of *nut-crackers* that belonged tc Him. He must then have destroyed somebody's property, and therefore this miracle does not fall within the definition of miracles given by Bishop Chandler, that they must be such works as 'it is consistent with the perfection of God tc interest Himself in.' St. Ambrose makes it part of the parable of the barren fig-tree recorded by St. Luke. It is therefore to be understood, on Origen's principle, as one o the things to be done, mentioned as already done. Dr Whitby has rightly understood it as a type of the destruc tion of the Jewish nation. This is its allegorical meaning

The leaves are the barren literal interpretation. Jesus will look for figs; that is, mystical allegorical meanings. The letter of the Bible must undergo a good overturning, a digging into its roots, and a dunging, and after that it will bring forth mystical fruit. This will be at the second advent, which means not a literal coming of Christ, but a descent of wisdom upon the Church. It shall come on the clouds of the law and the prophets. St. Jude says the Lord will come with ten thousand of His saints; which is explained by Origen that He shall come *in His holy thousands of allegorists* to criticize upon all Scriptures, and to convince ministers of the letter of their abominable errors, and of their horrid blasphemies spoken against the law and the prophets.

The lame man at the pool of Bethesda.

The man at the pool of Bethesda was evidently more afflicted with laziness than lameness. Nobody knows what was the matter with him. One would think from the stories which John records in his Gospel that he intended to blast the reputation of his Master by trying how far he could impose on the credulity of men. No historian mentions the existence of that miraculous pool. Why did not Josephus speak of it? It would be very extraordinary if a man were to write the natural history of Somersetshire, and say nothing of the mineral waters at Bath. It is strange that the angelical favour was left to the struggle of the multitude. Why was not the benefit sold to some rich lord or merchant, and the profits divided among the other poor and distressed people? St. John surely meant to banter us when he said the *blind, lame,* and *withered* put in for a prize that depended on their going down into the water. St. Ambrose has well said that the *letter* of the *New* as well as of the *Old Testament* 'lies abominably.' But why did Jesus miss such an opportunity of healing the multitude? The Bishop of Lichfield says that Jesus wherever He went healed all that came to him without distinction,—the *impotent, halt,* and *withered.* 'He certainly,' Woolston says, 'had his eye on this text where Jesus healed *one* of them. For such circumspection of thought, such exactness of expression and acuteness of wit, I admire that relate, and must needs say of him, whether he ever be

CHAP. XI.

translated to Canterbury or York or not, he is an *arch* bishop.' The story of the man at the pool of Bethesda is a profound mystery. St. Chrysostom says that in itself it is incredible, and we must look for the thing typified. Our translators had no right to insert the word 'market' after sheep. The Greek is, *ἐπὶ τῇ προβατικῇ κολυμβήθρα*. The *κολυμβήθρα* was the *piscina*,—in the Church the laver of regeneration; and it was *ἐπὶ τῇ προβατικῇ* for the flock of Christ. The pool was at Jerusalem, but this is the *New Jerusalem*, the entrance to which is by the mystical laver.

The five porches are the five books of Moses.

Bethesda is the house of grace. It has five porches, which are, as Augustine and Theophylact say, the five books of Moses. At these five books of Moses lie a great multitude of *impotent* folk—*blind, halt, withered.* These are the people who do not take the Bible as the Fathers did, in the allegorical sense, but depend on the letter of the law. They are so afflicted with the letter that they cannot be cured without an angel from heaven. *The certain man* is mankind in general. The infirmity is the same as the woman's who was bowed down eighteen years. The man lay in the porches of Bethesda thirty-eight years, that is, 3,800 years—2,000 under the law and 1,800 under the Gospel, not understanding the spirit of prophecy. St. Augustine, who always added to Catholic antiquity something original of his own, said that as thirty-eight was two short of forty, and these two are doubtless the love of God and his neighbour, the man who wants these must be a paralytic.

The fourth discourse was dedicated to Francis Hare, Bishop of St. Asaph. He was chosen for this honour because of his 'admirable satire against modern orthodoxy and persecution,' called 'Difficulties and Discouragements attending the Study of the Scriptures,' and because Collins, his pupil at King's, had learnt from him the love of liberty and religion. Convocation was not sitting, otherwise they would have been honoured with the dedication, and implored to recommend the 'discourse' to the clergy throughout the country. The first miracle considered is that of the

The man born blind.

man born blind. But can it be called a miracle that Jesus should restore sight to a blind man by the use of a peculiar ointment? It was certainly a strange kind of ointment,

such as was never before nor since known to cure blind eyes. St. Chrysostom said that it would sooner put a man's eyes out than restore sight to a blind man. We must go to the Fathers and learn the mystery. The blind man is a type of all nations. They are blind through adhering to the letter of Scripture. They are to have the eyes of their understanding opened on the Sabbath day, that is in the perfection of time. By the clay and the spittle, says St. John of Jerusalem, we are to understand perfect doctrine. The clay is the letter, but the mystical spittle is the water of the spirit which makes a mystical eye-salve.

The turning water into wine.

The next miracle is that of turning the water into wine at Cana of Galilee. St. Chrysostom speaks of some who were greatly offended with the story as recorded in John's Gospel. They did not think it was becoming in Jesus to be present at a riotous feast, that His mother and disciples should bear part in the revellings, and that He should make more wine when the company had already drunk more than enough. The Empress Eudocia has given a poetical description of this wedding. She makes it such a sumptuous and voluptuous feast, with such an abundance of mirth, music, and dancing as would be quite unbecoming the presence of a company of saints. Apollonius Tyanæus performed a similar miracle, when, for the entertainment of his friends, he commanded the table to be covered with a variety of dishes and the choicest wines. But Justin Martyr says that it is absurd to take literally the stories of the marriages and concubinages of the patriarchs, and so it would be absurd to take the wedding at Cana of Galilee literally. It is all a mystery, as St. Augustine shows. The six water-pots mean the six ages of the world; the two or three firkins are the divisions of mankind—Jews and Gentiles, or the descendants of the three sons of Noah; the water is the letter of Scripture, and the wine the spiritual interpretation. Theophilus of Antioch says that Jesus is the bridegroom, and Moses is the governor of the feast. It is the same as the feast in the Revelation to which all the fowls of the air shall be invited, that is, as Clemens Alexandrinus understood it, all heavenly Christians. They shall soar aloft on the sublime consideration of the allegorical sense of the Scriptures.

CHAP. XI.

The healing of the paralytic.

The last miracle in this discourse is healing the paralytic, which in absurdity is said to surpass all the miracles of Jesus. It would require an ingenious mind to invent a romantic story consisting of so many impossible circumstances. There was no need of such haste as to take the man to the top of the house. They had only to wait a little time, and the crowd would be dispersed. If they could not come to the door of the house, how could they get to the side of it? Did they go over the heads of the people? Did they get up by pulleys, ropes, or ladders? Let us come at once to the mystery. Let us hear the Fathers. The four bearers are the four Evangelists. The house where Jesus was is the house of wisdom. The top of it is the sublime sense of the Bible; and the tiles, as the venerable Bede said, are the letter of the Scriptures, which must be removed.

The resurrection of Lazarus.

The fifth discourse was dedicated to Thomas Sherlock, Bishop of Bangor. Its subject is the three resurrections—that of Lazarus, of Jairus's daughter, and of the widow's son of Nain. The ruler's daughter was but an insignificant girl, twelve years of age. There could be no end in raising her to life, except to wipe away tears from the eyes of parents, who ought to have been better philosophers than to be crying for the dead child. If she really was dead, which after all is doubtful, a lecture on patience or resignation would have been more appropriate. But she was only asleep, or in a swoon, probably caused by the screams of the women, as Theophylact and Theophanes Cerameus conjecture. The widow's son was only a youth, of no more importance than the ruler's daughter. There was more of the appearance of death in him, for he was carried forth to his burial. But who knows what fraud or mistake may have been in the case? Perhaps Jesus suspected that the youth was only in a state of lethargy, or there may have been some contrivance between the youth and his mother to further the fame of Jesus as a miracle-worker. Lazarus, too, was only an insignificant person. Why did not Jesus raise John the Baptist? Why did He not restore to life some magistrate or merchant who were benefactors to the community? It is strange that the first three Evangelists

should say nothing of the most important of Christ's miracles—the resurrection of Lazarus. When a man writes the life of a hero, he does not leave room for biographers who come afterwards to add the greatest events in the hero's life. May not Lazarus have consented to be buried alive in a cave as long as a man could live without food? The story is so full of absurdities that when John wrote it he must have outlived his reason and his senses. It was a fine prologue in Martha to say, '*By this time he stinketh.*' St. Basil asks why Jesus wept when He was about to bring Lazarus again from the dead. Grief like this was childish and effeminate. A stoical apathy would have been more becoming. Epiphanius says that some of the ancient Catholics were so much offended by the words, '*Jesus wept,*' that they expunged them from their Bibles. Why did Jesus call Lazarus with a *loud voice?* Was he more deaf than Jairus's daughter or the widow's son? or was it that his soul was further off? The napkin ought certainly to have been removed, that the spectators might have seen in Lazarus's face the transformation from death to life. But what became of these persons after they were raised? Ignatius says that the little child whom Jesus placed in the midst of the disciples became a renowned bishop. We might have expected Lazarus and the widow's son to have been eminent preachers of the Gospel. Of the persons on whom Jesus performed His miracles we hear nothing more except what Eusebius says of the woman who had the issue of blood, that she caused costly statues of Jesus and herself to be erected at Cesarea Philippi. Dr. Whitby does not believe what Eusebius says, but the chanter of Sarum was rather tainted with infidelity. Epiphanius, indeed, says that Lazarus lived thirty years after his resurrection, but whether for good or evil is not recorded. St. Augustine says that he gave a large account of hell; but, with due deference to the Bishop of Hippo, it is not to be credited that the soul of Lazarus went there. St. Ambrose wonders why the people were turned out of the house when the ruler's daughter was raised. Would it not have been better that they had remained as witnesses? St. Hilary says that there was no such person as Jairus. The name

Was Lazarus really dead?

CHAP. XI.

Allegorical meaning of these miracles.

was fictitious; allegorically it means Moses. The three persons raised are figures of three kinds of sinners. The ruler's daughter represents those who have conceived sin in their hearts, but have not yet brought it forth into deeds. The widow's son, those who have passed into actual sin. Lazarus, old sinners far gone, their souls in a state of putrefaction. The bearers of the young men are vices, evil spirits, heretics, and seducers. The stone at the grave of Lazarus is the hardness of the sinner's heart.

The resurrection of Jesus.

The subject of the sixth and last discourse is the resurrection of Jesus. This discourse is dedicated to John Potter, Bishop of Oxford. The objections which Woolston makes are not many, and they are mostly conjectures. As Jesus had said He was to rise again, it is concluded that there was an agreement between the chief priests and the disciples to be present at the opening of the seals of the sepulchre on the third day, that is, the Monday following. But the body was clandestinely removed on the Sunday, a day before the time predicted. Three or four soldiers were enough to form a guard, and this being passover time, when there were great festivities in Jerusalem, it is possible the soldiers may have had an *opiate*. A similar case is recorded by Herodotus. The disciples were not above taking a hint. 'Peter, who could curse and swear like a trooper, would hardly scruple to fuddle a few foot-soldiers.' Why did not Jesus after His resurrection appear before Pilate and the chief priests, and upbraid them for their unbelief? As in all the miracles of Jesus, we must turn away from the absurdities and impossibilities of the letter, and learn what the Catholic Fathers have to tell us of the mystery. The sepulchre, says Origen, is the letter of the Scriptures, in which Jesus is bound, as in a rock. Those who crucified Jesus, says St. John of Jerusalem, are the ministers of the letter. The rending of the veil, says St. Jerome, is the removing of the veil of the letter from the law and the prophets. The rending of the rocks is the opening of the oracles of God, which before were as hard as a rock. The earthquake is the shaking of men's hearts. Barabbas is Antichrist, or the letter of Scripture, and the multitude cry out for it, and demand the crucifixion of Christ; that is, the mystical and allegorical meaning.

CHAP. XI.

It was some time before Woolston could prevail on any of the clergy to enter into controversy with him. The coarseness and vulgarity of his language, added to a vile buffoonery, which rarely rose to the dignity of either raillery or wit, marked him out as a man whom it was wiser to let alone than to approach. But the Christianity of his day was in low esteem. Thoughtful men like Collins, and even judicious men in the Church, were branded with evil names. The clergy were despised by the people, who had lost faith in their teachers, and were but too ready to believe that Christianity had no solid foundation on which to rest. There was, however, undoubted ability of a certain kind in Woolston's writings, which, added to their popularity, demanded that they should be noticed. Nor did he wait in vain. In the number and variety of the publications evoked, this controversy was scarcely surpassed by any that preceded it. The author of a pamphlet called 'Free Thoughts on Mr. Woolston and his Writings,' gave a catalogue of fifty-eight pieces, besides several that were then in the press. Some were written in Woolston's style, with his vulgarity, and without his ability. The title of one was, 'Tom of Bedlam's Letter to his Cousin, Tom Woolston.' Another was, 'For God or the Devil; or, Just Chastisement no Persecution, being the Christian Cry to the Legislature for Exemplary Punishment of Public and Pernicious Blasphemers, particularly THAT WRETCH WOOLSTON.' He is further described as, 'the devil's bellwether,' that *canis qui ablatrat contra lucem veritatis*. The cry for persecution, unfortunately, was listened to, and the vehement advocate of patristic learning was sentenced to pay a heavy fine and to suffer a long imprisonment. That the clergy were the authors of the prosecution of Woolston is probably true, but it is also true that Clarke and Whiston were unceasing in their endeavours to stop it. The Archbishop also expressed himself as opposed to the prosecution, but he told the chief justice that he wished less had been said about the hireling clergy. This was the crowning offence. Woolston mentions an interview which he had with the Archbishop, in which the conversation turned on the Fathers, and he says that he never heard any man talk with such learning and judgment as the

Woolston's opponents.

CHAP. XI.

primate did on that occasion. The Archbishop was William Wake, whose reverence for Christian antiquity was second only to Woolston's.

Several dissenting ministers wrote with considerable ability in reply to the 'Discourses on the Miracles.' Many of them take notice of the prosecution, condemning it as unchristian in principle and bad in policy. Among these was Nathanael Lardner, who vindicated the three resurrections. There was nothing in his arguments which had not been urged by others; but he nobly took his stand on the reasonableness of Christianity. We live, he said, in a rational age; and if we believe that Christianity can stand the test of reason, then let us use reason in its defence, and not persecution. Simon Brown, another preacher among the Dissenters, wrote 'Some Remarks on Mr. Woolston's Fifth Discourse,' the same which was the subject of Dr. Lardner's treatise. He gave his pamphlet this title—'A Fit Rebuke to a Ludicrous Infidel,' and vindicated the lawfulness of using ridicule in controversies about religion. He subscribed to Shaftesbury's principle, that religion suffers nothing from it except it be ridiculous. Elijah ridiculed Baal. Had his ridicule been misplaced it would have recoiled on himself—

Nathanael Lardner on the miracles.

'Risu inepto res ineptior nulla est.'

Brown describes Woolston's object as setting all on the mystical meaning, and after this is done to make as much diversion with it as he tried to do with the letter. It is not correct, he says, to represent the Evangelists, especially the first three, as endeavouring to aggrandize their Master as a miracle worker. Their general design seems rather to have been to give an account of the more public acts of His life. John adds some private matters, as the miracle of Cana, the conversation with the woman of Samaria, the interview with Nicodemus, and the resurrection of Lazarus. Why, he states, should we expect Lazarus or the widow's son to be ministers of the Gospel? Might they not have been of more service to Christianity by staying at home—one at Bethany, the other at Nain—where people could send to learn if such persons lived in these towns? The resurrection of Jairus's daughter was as good a proof of the power o

Simon Brown on miracles.

esus to raise the dead as if she had been a woman of thirty. CHAP. XI.
he shrieking women were more likely to recover her from
fit than to put her into one. Death is often called sleep
y profane authors. Cicero says, 'Quid est melius quam in
iediis vitæ laboribus obdormiscere et ita conniventes somno
onsopiri sempiterno?' If death is here called an endless
leep, how much more appropriate was it for Jesus to say of the
uler's daughter, 'She is not dead, but sleepeth,' seeing He
as about to restore her again to life! The widow's son
ay have been as useful a person as a rich merchant. It
as both human and natural for his mother to weep.

'Naturæ imperio gemimus cum funus adultæ
Virginis occurrit.'

is a poor remark to say that the widow had tears at
and. It was far more becoming in Jesus to weep for His
iend Lazarus than to show the indifference of a Stoic. He
as a true man, His heart was all human.

'Mollissima corda
Humano generi dare se Natura fatetur
Cúm lachrymas,' etc.

ow did Woolston know that the persons restored to life
ld no tales of the other world? If they had been recorded,
ould he not have made as merry with the other-world
les of an insignificant boy and girl as he did with the
rratives of the Evangelists?

The longest and most elaborate answer to Woolston was by Bishop Smalbroke on miracles.
ishop Smalbroke. As the third discourse was dedicated
him, he was fairly challenged to the combat. The
shop's work was diffuse, full of long quotations, and
arned; in fact, he put all his learning into it. The two
lumes were dedicated, one to the Queen-Regent, the other
the King. The bishop defended the prosecution, which
said was not persecution, for 'licentious invectives
ainst the Founder of our religion' and 'a professed
dicule of the Christian miracles are libels cognizable by
e Christian magistracy.' The first and most manifest of
oolston's errors was his affirming that the Fathers denied
e literal sense of the Gospel narratives. The passages he
oted showed that this was not the case. Origen, St.
ugustine, St. Hilary, and St. Jerome were doubtless very

CHAP. XI.

The Fathers did not deny the literal meaning.

absurd individuals considered as interpreters of the Scrip tures, but they were not responsible for all with whicl Woolston charged them. Bishop Smalbroke did not un dertake to vindicate all that the Fathers said. He had n sympathy with their allegorizing of the Scriptures. H did not believe that they were safe guides in theology, an he intimated that the cause of Woolston's perverseness c mind, not to say aberration of intellect, was due to his fonc ness for the allegories of the Fathers, especially of Origen In his discourses on the miracles Woolston quoted everythin he could find in Catholic antiquity that made for his side that is, everything that was likely to make Catholic anti quity ridiculous. That he often quoted honestly and care fully is true, but Bishop Smalbroke showed that in man cases his quotations were imperfect, and bore a differen meaning in the context from that which they were made t bear in the quotation. Moreover, Woolston quoted Father that are not acknowledged as Fathers, and the spuriou pieces of genuine Fathers, as the 'De Antichristo' of S Augustine; and in some cases he quoted words put into th mouth of objectors without adding the answers that wer made to them. It was admitted that Origen especially ha frequently spoken contemptuously of the letter of th Scriptures. Yet even here we must remember that in man cases we have not Origen's text, but only the imperfec Latin version of Ruffinus. And when Woolston quotes hir as saying that some things in the Gospels could not be done and some as done which were not actually done, the re ference is to such passages as '*Salute no man by the way*' '*Provide not two coats,*' and Jesus seeing all the worl from the top of the mountain.

A miracle defined.

After these remarks Bishop Smalbroke proceeds to consider miracles in general, and then the particular miracles of the New Testament which, according to Woolston, were impossible and absurd. The bishop defined a true miracle as properly a 'supernatural operation, disagreeing with and repugnant to the usual course of things, and the known laws of nature, either as to the subject-matter or the manner of its performance.' The miracles of Jesus are not to be compared with those done by evil spirits. These are mere *signs*

ıd *wonders* which surprise weak and wicked men, but can- ot deceive the elect. The pretended miracles of Apollonius ·e foolish and monstrous. Besides, the character of the ıan evidently shows that they were false. He was a ·alous worshipper of the Pagan gods. His pride and nbition were excessive. He had a vain affectation for ·vine honours. A miracle is to be judged by the moral as ell as the historical evidence. Origen laid down a just iterion that the lives and morals of those who profess to ›rk miracles are to be taken in evidence, and also the ndencies and consequences of the miracles themselves, hether they are prejudicial to men or whether they reform eir morals. Tacitus says that Apollonius pretended to ›rk miracles in order to recommend Vespasian to the ›ople as a person favoured by God. This may be true; d in that case it is possible that the miracles may have ·en wrought by the power of God, who may have wished to ve some superior dignity to Vespasian, as he, with Titus, was be the signal instrument of Divine vengeance on the wish nation. Their object, however, was merely political. ıey did not approach in dignity the miracles of Jesus, which ›re wrought to establish his Divine authority. As to the racles of the Irish Greatrakes, who seems to have anticited modern mesmerism, the bishop said they were only ıtative. He never pretended to work infallible cures. hen he failed in any attempt he had recourse to physic d surgery. Woolston had quoted the twelfth chapter of e first Epistle to the Corinthians to show that the power working miracles did not imply that the worker of them s invested with a Divine commission. He quoted also . Augustine, who said that when we see a visible miracle are not to infer a visible sanctity. The bishop answered ıt the miracles mentioned in the tenth verse as spiritual ts to the believers were only a particular kind of miracles. is evident from the ninth verse that they did not include ' gifts of healing;' and to the quotation from Augustine answered, that it accorded with the words of Jesus to ›se who said they had cast out devils in His name, and ıe many wonderful works, which throws us again on the ral character of the miracle worker, and though the

False miracles.

405

CHAP. XI.

capacity to work a certain kind of miracles does not prove a Divine commission, yet the miracles of Jesus prove His Divine authority, as He could do all kinds of miracles, for *God gave not the spirit by measure to Him.*

Woolston's arguments frivolous.

Woolston had objected to the expulsion of the traders from the temple on the ground that Jesus had neither the right nor the power to do it. This was easily answered by the remark of the Evangelist, that all the multitude took Jesus for a prophet. He had just been hailed by the inhabitants of Jerusalem as the king who cometh in the name of the Lord. With all the people very attentive to hear Him, it could not have been difficult for Him to expel those who profaned His Father's house. It is but a frivolous question to ask about His anxiety for a building which He was soon to destroy, and a service which he was about to abolish. The temple was consecrated to the worship of God, and the law of Moses was not yet annulled. St Hilary did not say that there was no market in the temple. He said that the dove was the Holy Ghost, and the Jews had not that, and therefore they could not sell it. He was not speaking of the market. It is admitted that in Jerusalem there were others besides Jews who exorcised evil spirits. It is not clear to whom Jesus referred when He spoke to the Jews about *their* children casting out devils. Augustine and some of the Fathers wishing to confine exorcism to Christ and His followers explained 'their children' as the seventy disciples. The bishop concludes that if before Jesus devils were cast out, it was done by the invocation of the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

The swine in Gadara.

Gadara was part of Decapolis, the region of the ten cities. The inhabitants were Greeks intermixed with Jews. That there were swine in that country is shown by Casaubon in passages cited from Strabo and Josephus. If the proprietors were apostate Jews, the loss of their property was a just punishment for their apostasy. If they were Gentiles, this miracle may have been wrought to cure them of demon-worship. In either case the Gadarenes were amply compensated for the loss of their swine by having 6,000 devils cast out of a man. In the *transfiguration* it is a poor remark of Woolston's that the Greek word signifies a

ıange of form. The Evangelist explains what the trans-guration was when he says of Jesus, *His face did shine s the sun, His countenance was white as the light.* Ἔξοδος is a Hebraism, the Latin words *Excitus* and *Excessus* ere frequently used for death. The Hellenist Jews used ıe word Ἔξοδος in the same sense, and so does St. Peter ı his Epistles. This was designedly a private miracle rought for the benefit of the three disciples. Why, ıen, should it be asked that it was not done before the ıultitude?

The woman with the issue of blood.

The first miracle in Woolston's second discourse is the oman with the *issue of blood.* Her affliction was evidently ıronic and confirmed, whatever may have been the nature it. As to her imagination curing her, she mus have had ɔod exercise for that when she believed so long in the ıysicians on whom she spent all her money. It is said ıe *suffered many things,* which implied that she had gone ırough severe courses of physic. The whole account of ıe woman with the *spirit of infirmity* shows that this was a ɨrious affliction. The Jews in Christ's time were very ɨrict about keeping the Sabbath. It was one of their ıperstitions. The law of Moses admitted works of neces-ty and mercy, but they made void the law through their aditions. It is in keeping with all that we know of this ɔirit of Pharisaism to complain of Jesus doing a miracle on .e Sabbath Day. Josephus records that the Jews lost .eir city by refusing on that day to fight with the Romans. ıe attempt to ridicule the conversation with the woman of ɜmaria shows how easy it is to ridicule anything. Might ɔt all the prophets in this way be called fortune-tellers?

The cursing of the fig-tree

The *fig-tree* which Jesus cursed is the miracle most fficult of defence, excepting perhaps that of the devils in ɜdara. Mark evidently speaks of a kind of fig-tree that ɜd fruit on it at that season. It is fair to conclude this ɔm the parable, if there were no other reason. *He sought uit and found nothing but leaves.* What St. Augustine ys on this subject is not to be taken for much. He had ɜt studied the natural history of fruit-trees, and what he ɔote about this miracle ought to have had a place in his ɛtractations. Ambrose calls the miracle a parable. He

CHAP. XI.

means that its meaning lay deeper than the surface. It w said that those who had faith were to do not only what was done to the fig-tree, but remove mountains, and, as t disciples had never done this, Woolston argued that th miracle had never been performed. The bishop asked ho Woolston knew that the Apostles never removed mou tains? St. Jerome says that Hilarius did remove mou tains, and St. Chrysostom spoke of holy persons, inferior the Apostles, who did the same. Gregory Nyssa says that Gregory Thaumaturgus by a word removed a vast rock ou of its place. Even in the middle ages Paulus Venet speaks of a rock in Persia which was removed by a Christia and the miracle was so wonderful that many Mahometa were converted to Christianity. 'Those who, like Woo ston,' adds the Bishop, 'believe implicity in the Fathe ought to receive their testimonies. If we consider t punitive acts in the miracles of cursing the fig-tree and t destruction of swine were performed on inferior creatur which are but the appendages, so to speak, of men, it w appear that, comparatively, they were acts of goodness a mercy. What was the destruction of a fig-tree, if by Jesus taught a great lesson of the righteousness of God If Woolston had mentioned in what part of Origen the ten thousand holy allegorists are spoken of, the Bishop wou have turned to it, but as the reference had been omitt the passages were not to be found. The other miracle this 'Discourse' is that at the pool of Bethesda. It surely nothing against it that it is not mentioned by Jos phus. There are many things which Josephus does not mention. Tertullian had already answered this objection. He said that the pool of Bethesda lost its healing qualities through the unbelief of the Jews; there was, therefore, no reason for Josephus, when he wrote, to speak of the virtue of its waters. But Josephus did speak of a pool at Jerusalem, and he called it by the very word used by the Evangelist, *κολυμβήθρα*. He says nothing of its miraculous cures, yet even this may be accounted for, as he only mentions it incidentally, and promises in another book to give a more complete description of Jerusalem and its walls. In this book he may have related all that was known of t

The man at the pool of Bethesda.

ool of Bethesda. It is idle to make objections against ny particular means of healing. God can surely choose His own means. That only one a year was healed may have etter secured the object than that many should have been ealed. The annual recurrence of the miracle served to eep up a sense of God's presence in the nation. It was ot true that the magistrates took no care of the pool, for hey provided the sick people with a hospital, and five orches or cells for passing down into the water when it as troubled by the angel. But the healing of the soul is reater than the healing of the body. The angel descended nce and one was benefited, but Jesus descended into the aters of baptism that all might be healed.

The man born blind.

The Bishop's second volume begins with the miracle on *he man who was born blind*. That he really had been born lind was attested by his parents, and it has never been nown that natural blindness could be cured by any art of an. The use of means that could not of themselves pro-uce the effect was very appropriate. It served to show hat Jesus did not act in a natural but a supernatural man-er. It was symbolical, and accorded with the custom of he old prophets. Moses lifting up his rod to divide the ed Sea, and casting the tree into the waters of Marah; lijah stretching himself on the child; Elisha with the cruse f salt taking away the unwholesomeness of the waters of ericho, are instances of the custom. The merriment which oolston made over the *spittle* would have been less had e known that the use of spittle on the Sabbath was for-idden by the Jewish law, and that Jesus may have wished protest against this superstition. The washing at Siloam, ays Irenæus, was an emblem or a type of the efficacy of aptism. The objections concerning the man sick of the alsy being let down through the tiles are not worth *noticing*. eople who know the construction of Eastern houses feel one of the difficulties which Woolston supposed. St. Jerome, his day, described a Jewish house for the benefit of those ho thought the circumstances of this miracle strange. It not to be wondered at that the resurrection of Lazarus is ot mentioned by the other Evangelists. They do not pro-ss to record the events of the time into which the miracle

CHAP. XI.

Arguments from omissions not valid.

falls. The additional miracles recorded by St. John are omitted for the same reason. Eusebius, of Cæsarea, says that the first three Evangelists confine their narratives t the period of one year, beginning with the imprisonment o John the Baptist. Similar omissions may be found in pro fane authors. No historian, till Josephus, mentioned th vision which Alexander had in Asia, and in which he wa encouraged to subdue the Persian Empire. It is not re corded in the earlier lives of Pythagoras that he did no entirely abstain from eating beans and the flesh of som kinds of animals. Xenophon does not tell us that Socrate discoursed about physics, and yet Plato does tell us. Th loud voice at the tomb did not regard Lazarus, but th people who stood by. The supposition of a compact be tween the chief priests and the Apostles is an extravagan invention. The disciples did not even expect the resur rection. A *watch* was not a few soldiers, but a large body. *Three days* and the *third day* were equivalent expressions. This the Bishop shows by many passages from the Old Testament. That Jesus did rise again is as well-attested as any event in history can be. We have no instance of men persevering to death in what they knew to be a lie, and when, by confessing it, they might have saved their lives. The Apostles gave their lives in attestation of what they saw and knew.

Bishop Pearce on the miracles of Jesus.

Of all who wrote answers to Woolston we at once give the palm to Zachary Pearce, Bishop of Rochester. His pamphlet, called 'The Miracles of Jesus Vindicated,' consisted only of eighty-six pages, but it was a perfect model of controversial writing. He began with the resurrection of Jesus, the miracle on which historical Christianity rests. He reasoned rightly that if this miracle is credible all the other miracles of Jesus are credible, but if this fails in evidence the others must fail too. He insisted that as the objections had been made on the supposition that the accounts were written by the Evangelists, the same supposition must be allowed to stand in the defence. He thinks it impossible that the Apostles could be deceived in the resurrection of Jesus, for *He showed himself alive by many infallible proofs, being seen of them forty days.* There

were twelve distinct appearances, during which the disciples conversed with Him, ate and drank with Him, and handled Him with their hands. He submitted to a close examination by Thomas. He promised them power from on high, and the gift of tongues. They knew in their own *inward* perception, which in the judgment of some is more certain than the *outward*, that they had the gifts which were promised. All the Apostles unanimously asserted the resurrection of their Master, and maintained it with their dying breath, even when expiring under the most cruel tortures. The objections are reduced to these four. (1.) Jesus did not rise at the time He foretold. (2.) Some of His disciples did not know Him when He appeared to them. (3.) He did not personally show Himself to the chief priests and elders as (it is supposed) He ought to have done to convince them. (4.) The stone at the mouth of the grave being sealed, and the seal being broken open when the sealers were not present, there is room to suspect fraud and imposture.

Objections to the resurrection of Jesus answered.

The answers are:—(1.) It *was* the third day. The Jews reckoned from sunset to sunset, which, indeed, seems to have been the custom with the Greeks, for a day and a night was *νυχθήμερον*, the night, before the day. Then any part of the twenty-four hours between the sunsets was counted a day. A child, for instance, was to be circumcised on the eighth day, but, if born only an hour before sunset, that hour was reckoned a day. Now as Jesus died about three in the afternoon on Friday, by six o'clock one day had passed. Saturday was another day, and Sunday was the third. Porphyry has a passage in his Homeric questions which fitly illustrates this mode of reckoning—'He that is at home in the evening and goes abroad in the morning of the third day is said to be from home on the third day, though there be only one day complete, which is the middle one.' The third day was the same as after three days. In 2 Chron. x. 5, Rehoboam said to the people, *Come unto me again after three days*. In verse twelve we read that *the people came to Rehoboam on the third day, as the king commanded*. The most difficult form of the words is in Matt. xii. 40, where it is said of Jesus that He was to

CHAP. XI.

be in the earth three days and three nights. But the difficulty is only in our forgetting the *day-night* of the Jews and Greeks. They sometimes called the twenty-four hours a *day and a night*, and as the words were equivalent, the part of a day which was called a day was also called a day-night. There is a remarkable instance of this in the book of Esther. In chap. iv. 16, Esther declares she would *fast* with her people, *the Jews, three days, night and day*, yet we find in her in chap. v. 1, 4, *upon the third day at a banquet* with the King and Haman, her adversary. (2.) There was nothing marvellous in the disciples not knowing Jesus when they saw Him after His resurrection. They did not expect that He was to rise again. Their deliverer, who was to redeem Israel, was crucified, and with this their hope of deliverance was gone. There was wisdom in His revealing Himself to them by degrees. They had to be prepared for it, too sudden an appearance might have been injurious. On the way to Emmaus He was probably in the garb of a traveller. It was dark, and so their eyes were holden. All that can be said is that the disciples did not at first believe but they believed afterwards. (3.) The chief priests and rulers had seen enough to convince them had they not been obstinate. They saw His miracles. They knew of the rending of the temple veil, and the darkness which followed the crucifixion. But, supposing He had appeared to them we could only have known of it by testimony, and which testimony would have been greater, that of the chief priest or that of the Apostles, who sealed their testimony with martyrdom? Had we depended only on the testimony of the priests, how easy might it have been said that it was only a national contrivance of the Jews, a trick of State, or political craft. (4.) The supposition of a contract between the chief priest and the disciples is 'quite original.' The Gospel record is that when Jesus was crucified the disciples all fled for their lives.

The disciples did not believe that He was to rise again.

To such objections as are generally made to many of the miracles it is a sufficient general answer to remember that it was 1700 years since they were wrought, and that the climate, language, and customs of the people were very different from ours. The story, moreover, is often told in a

Difficulties may sometimes be explained.

short and uncircumstantial manner, and there are allusions to history and geography, with which we are not fully acquainted. Things may seem strange, and even absurd to us which were quite familiar to the people of Judea. St. Hilary did not deny the existence of a market in the temple, but there is other evidence even better than this. In the Babylonian Talmud it is said that forty days before the temple was destroyed, the Great Council removed from the place where they used to assemble in the inner court of the temple and *sat among the shops*. This place is frequently mentioned as the place where goods were sold, and money exchanged. It was in the outer court, or court of the Gentiles. St. Augustine is quoted as saying that there could be no great sin in buying and selling things in the temple that were for the temple service. But it is not this that Jesus condemned. It was the unjust and unrighteous trade carried on there which He opposed. The traders had made the temple a *den of thieves*. It is not difficult to suppose that Jesus could expel the buyers and sellers when we read that the people were on His side, and the chief priests were *afraid*. Nor does it matter much that the temple was soon to be destroyed. In 1728 the churchwardens of St. Botolph's, Bishopsgate, got an Act of Parliament to pull down that church; but that would not have justified its profanation, so long as it stood for Divine worship. Woolston had expressed wonder that the demoniacs of Gadara were among the tombs. Bishop Pearce answered that it was not easy to give a reason for the fancies of madmen. The Jews buried their dead in caves in the mountains, wild desert places, just such as would attract men of this kind. It cannot be said no care was taken of them, for they were bound with fetters and chains. Gadara was joined to Syria by Pompey. Augustus gave it to Herod. It was again annexed to Syria. The inhabitants were partly Jews and partly Syrians. The passage in St. Mark about the time of figs, as it stands in our version, Pearce calls 'downright nonsense.' The time was about three days before the passover. It was not yet the time or season of figs, but there were early figs that might be gathered at the time of the passover. Josephus mentions

The time of figs.

CHAP. XI.

that at this season some Jewish robbers made an excursion from the castle of Maisanda and carried off all the *ripe fruits* belonging to the town of Engaddi. These early figs are often mentioned by the prophets. In Hosea ix. 10, *I saw your fathers as the first-ripe in the fig tree.* Jeremiah xxiv. 2, speaks of a *basket that had very good figs, even like the figs that are first ripe.* Isaiah xxviii. 4, calls it the *hasty fruit before the summer.* It was not yet the time of gathering the figs. The fig harvest had not yet arrived. On the second day of unleavened bread, about six days after this, the first fruits were solemnly offered in the temple, and until that time the owners of the fig-trees were not allowed to gather the fruit. It was not, then, in any way unreasonable that at this season Jesus should have expected figs on his fig-tree. Tradition says that the marriage of Cana of Galilee was the marriage of Cleophas and Mary, the sister of Jesus's mother. Why should not Jesus have been present at His aunt's wedding? 'These weddings,' Bishop Pearce says, 'had not the indecencies witnessed at weddings amongst us. Well drunk does not mean that there was excessive drinking. The Greek word *μεθύειν* signifies primarily to drink after the sacrifice. The word is used in the Septuagint, where it is said of Joseph's brethren that *they drank and were merry with him,* which in the circumstances could scarcely have meant drinking to excess. It is again used in Haggai i. 6, when God says to the Jews, *Ye drink, but ye are not filled with drink,* ἐπίετε καὶ οὐκ εἰς μέθην, where it is evident from the context that it does not mean drunkenness.'

'The Trial of the Witnesses.'

'The Trial of the Witnesses of the Resurrection of Jesus,' by Bishop Sherlock, was another of the defences which came out of the Woolston controversy. The discussion is primarily on the nature of evidence. The subject of the resurrection of Jesus is taken as the test. The general facts on which both sides agree are, that Jesus declared Himself a prophet, that He put the proof of His mission on this,—that He would die openly and publicly rise again the third day. When He found that He was to be put to death, He did not shrink from the trial. He was not crucified by His disciples, but by His enemies, the Romans and the Jews. As they were

n good earnest about their work, it is not likely that they would omit any caution to make sure of His being really put to death. The question discussed is the resurrection. The witnesses are described by the counsel for Woolston as: —(1.) An angel, or angels, which appeared to the women. They were like men, and therefore must be taken for men. The women could not witness to the presence of angels if they only saw men; at the best, the evidence only amounts o apparitions appearing to women. (2.) The women themselves, what are they worth? Poor silly women. (3.) The wo disciples who met him on the way to Emmaus. All the ime during which He conversed with them they did not now Him. How, then, could they be eye-witnesses? Their eyes were holden that they knew Him not. (4.) The disciples among whom Jesus appeared. They are frightened, aking Him for a spectre. He had already refused to let Mary Magdalene touch Him, but now He invites the Apostles o handle Him. What body did they examine? The body hat came in when the doors were shut? Is it credible that God should raise a body bearing the very wounds of which t died? There were more appearances, but the nations hat received the Gospel had not even this evidence. They believed on the testimony of Apostles or an Apostle. When nothing is asserted but what is probable, possible, nd according to the usual course of nature, a reasonable egree of evidence ought to satisfy every man; but when he thing testified is contrary to the order of nature, no estimony is sufficient to overturn the constant evidence which nature gives of the unfailing regularity of her operations.

Probability or possibility of miracles.

To this the Christian advocate replies that, if the thing is eally impossible, it is unnecessary to ask more evidence. Before we discuss the probability of miracles, we must first ettle the question as to the *possibility* of any miracle whatever. The advocate asked Woolston's counsel if he could nark out the limits of natural possibilities. All that we mean by the course of nature is the course of nature, *so far as it s known to us*. Every man, from the humblest labourer to he highest philosopher, forms to himself, from his own xperience and observation, a notion of the course of nature,

CHAP. XI.

and is ready to say of everything beyond this observation, that it is contrary to the course of nature. We know by experience that all men die and do not rise again, and so we conclude that it is contrary to the course of nature for a man to rise again from the dead. But we only mean by course of nature that uniform settled order of things which is within the sphere of our observation. We have no right to suppose that, beyond this, there are no real laws of nature in accordance with which the dead may be raised. If we reason on this supposition, our reasoning is without a foundation; for our knowledge of nature is limited, and cannot be made the measure of the infinitude which lies beyond. It is not, then, a question of possibility but of probability, and therefore testimony must have the weight which belongs to it. There is positive evidence that, after the resurrection, the body of Jesus was seen, felt, and handled by many persons.

The resurrection of Jesus.

It may be difficult to explain why He said to Mary Magdalene, *Touch me not*. Probably He only meant that she would have many opportunities of doing so before He ascended to His Father. It is said that He came in the midst of the disciples when the doors were shut, but this may only be that He came in unnoticed by them. It is not intimated that the wounds in His side were uncured. They were not fresh and bleeding. The expression 'print of the nails' implies only a scar. The Jews had no cause to complain. The sepulchre was in their keeping. If it was necessary for Jesus to show himself to the chief priest, why not to Tiberius? And if these could not be convinced without a personal appearance, there is the same necessity for Christ appearing now in England. The fact rests on testimony to us and to them. The authors of the Gospels are particular in setting forth the evidence of the resurrection. The Apostles were *appointed* witnesses of it. The testimony of the men is surely not less to be believed because women also were witnesses. The Apostles had the power of working miracles given to them. Could they be in doubt whether or not they possessed the power? They lived miserably and died miserably, bearing witness to what they had seen and known. The man who does not deny the

ossibility of miracles, and yet does not believe the resurrec- ion of Jesus, must reject all miracles whatever be the testi- nony in evidence of them.

It is not necessary to follow this controversy further. No nan was ever more thoroughly refuted than Thomas Wool- ston. It seems a pity that such men as Pearce, Sherlock, nd Lardner should have been under the necessity of de- ending Christianity against one who, it is charitable to uppose, was not really sane. It was a pity in many re- pects that the Deist controversy reached its climax in a nadman. Woolston's mind was typical of the minds of a arge class which is fairly divided between believers and nbelievers. They can only be Christians while they can ean upon a book, a Church, primitive antiquity, or some xternal authority. When this prop fails, they are unbe- ievers. So long as Woolston could believe in the Fathers, ie was a Christian. When he found it impossible to believe Christianity on their authority, he was no more a believer. He had no eye to see the everlasting harmonies. He had no soul to feel that there is a Divine Christ in the miracles, whatever else we may know about them. That spirit which giveth life was more dead to him than the letter which he despised. He wrote against the clergy; perhaps they deserved it. He wrote much against the Gospels, and he could have written much more of the same kind. It is easy to raise a thousand plausible and ingenious objections to any- thing whatever, and as easy to make a thousand answers as plausible and ingenious, while the thing itself remains where it was.

Character of Woolston's mind.

Thomas Sherlock, author of 'The Trial of the Witnesses,' Dean of Chichester, and finally Bishop of London, preached the annual sermon in behalf of the 'Society for the Propaga- tion of the Gospel' in the year 1714. In that sermon he said: 'The religion of the gospel is the true original religion of reason and nature, and its precepts declarative of that original religion, which was as old as the creation.' This was a great commendation to the religion of the Gospel, and if it really had its foundation in nature and reason, the occasion on which Sherlock preached was a proper one for mentioning so important a fact. But was it any gain for

Thomas Sherlock.

CHAP. XI.

the Gospel to be so rational? And if its reasonableness was that for which it was commendable, did it not follow that if there was anything in it beyond or above nature and reason, that part was less commendable, that is, less commendable to reason than what was rational? Was that which constituted the substance of the Gospel nothing more than the religion of nature and reason? What Sherlock meant is a question into which we need not enter. Tindal understood him to mean that the Gospel and the religion of reason were identical, and to prove this proposition he wrote a book which he called, in the words of Sherlock, 'Christianity as Old as Creation.'

Matthew Tindal.

At Oxford.

Matthew Tindal was the son of a clergyman in Devonshire. He was sent to Oxford as a youth, and entered at Lincoln College. He afterwards obtained a fellowship at All Souls, which he held to the end of his life. If we reckon by the time of his appearing in the Deist controversy, he was one of the last of the English Deists; but he was really an older man than either Toland, Collins, or Woolston. In his seventieth year he published 'Christianity as Old as Creation,' but for many years he had been known as a controversial writer, and had been long regarded as an enemy of the Church and the clergy. Tindal's history is brief and uneventful, as the history of a man whose life is spent as a Fellow of a College must be, almost of necessity, but it is not without its lessons. He came to Oxford about the time of the Restoration. His mind being, as he tells us, in every way unfurnished, he readily fell in with the prevailing High-Church notions of the time. When the Roman Catholic emissaries of James II. came to Oxford, he was one of the first to conform to the Church of Rome, reasoning that if High-Churchism had any solid foundation, separation from Rome could not be justified. Going out into the world, or, as his biographer expresses it, 'by means of free conversation with gentlemen in public coffee-houses in London, he found the absurdities of Roman Catholicism to be greater than he had imagined.' He re-examined the constitution of the Church of England, and was convinced that High-Churchism had no foundation there. 'High-Churchmen,' he said, 'mean some other Church than the

Church of England,' which, 'being established by Acts of Parliament, is a perfect creature of the civil power.' As Tindal returned to Protestantism about the time of the abdication of James, his enemies did not fail to find a reason for the change, but his biographer maintains that his re-conversion took place before that event.

High Church and Low Church.

The Church of England in Tindal's day was divided into two leading parties. These were called High Church and Low Church. The former were the sincere defenders of the divine right of Episcopacy that they have been since the time of Laud. The latter consisted of the rational party, which included almost all the great English theologians of the last century. They are now called the Latitudinarians. Against High-Churchism, Tindal wrote several books; and long before he appeared as a Deist, High-Churchmen had consigned him to perdition. His old tutor, Dr. Hickes, called him 'Spinoza revived,' and Dr. Evans, another Oxford divine, sent him to banquet with the devil, in company with Hobbes, Spinoza, and Milton:—

'But above all the hot-brained atheist crew
That ever Greece or Rome or Britain knew,
Wave all their laurels and their palms to you.
Spinoza smiles and cries, the work is done.
Tindal shall finish (Satan's darling son)—
Tindal shall finish what Spinoza first begun.
Hobbes, Milton, Blount, Vanini with him join,—
All equally admire the vast design.'

'The Rights of the Christian Church.'

The chief of Tindal's publications on the Church question was a book called, 'The Rights of the Christian Church asserted against *Romish* and all other priests who claim an independent power over it.' As a defence of the Erastian constitution of the Church of England, and as a refutation of the claims of Episcopacy, this was one of the ablest books ever written on the subject. The author had the honour of a presentment, along with the printer and publisher, by the Grand Jury of Middlesex. The book was written against and preached against by High Churchmen at home, and commended for its learning and moderation by eminent divines of the Reformed Churches abroad. Le Clerc, who had a great respect for the Church of England, and was partial to Episcopal government, made it the subject of a

CHAP. XI.

long review in his *Bibliothèque Choisie*. The Lower House of Convocation—that judicious, circumspect, and always orthodox body of men—discovered that 'Le Clerc had been paid for commending Tindal's book, and that *infidels* (Tindal and his friends) had procured abstracts and commendations of their profane writings, probably drawn up by themselves, to be inserted in foregn journals, and that they had translated them into the English tongue, and published them here at home, in order to add the greater weight to their wicked opinions.'

'Christianity as Old as Creation.'

On the title-page of 'Christianity as Old as Creation' Tindal put several quotations as mottoes, expressing the scope of his argument. Some were from the New Testament, one from Grotius, one from Eusebius, and one from Samuel Clarke. After the passage mentioned from Bishop Sherlock, the most pointed was a sentence out of the 'Retractations of St. Augustine':—'The thing which is now called the Christian religion was also among the ancients, nor was it wanting from the beginning of the human race, until Christ Himself came in the flesh, when the true religion which then was began to be called Christian.'

The question was not raised whether Christianity be true or false. The whole inquiry was in what sense Christianity is true. Are we to believe it because of its internal evidence, its reasonableness, or because it is delivered to us on authority? Tindal did not deny the truth of traditional religion, but he held that tradition was too uncertain a foundation for religion to rest on. The external evidence of Christianity did not amount to a demonstration of its truth, and so long as the question of evidence was at issue, so long there was a question whether the essence of Christianity consisted in that which carries its own reason with it, or in that which depends merely on authority. The two parties into which the Church of England was divided, had already taken different sides on this question. The rational, or Low Churchmen, ever since the days of Hobbes, had been laying deep the foundations of natural religion. The High Churchmen attached great importance to the holy *rites*, and under the head of doctrines of the Gospel they rather embraced the speculative dogmas of the Church than the

Does not depend on authority.

moral teaching of Christianity. Whatever might be the value of positive rites or speculative doctrines, Tindal reasoned that they could not constitute the essence of Christianity, because they were not a part of natural religion, which did not, or rather could not, differ from revealed, except in the manner of its being communicated. They are both, he said, revelations of the same unchangeable will of a Being who is alike at all times infinitely good and wise. On the belief that there is a God, this must be His character; and if men are responsible for their actions, they must have, to some extent, the means of knowing what is the Divine will. From the beginning all men must have had some law or rule, by observing which they are acceptable to God. As no external revelation could do more than make men acceptable to God, the first natural, original, or internal law must have been perfect, and in itself incapable either of addition or diminution. The name Christianity may be of later date, but the thing itself must be as old and as extensive as human nature. It may be objected that all men have not equal knowledge, and that though this law of nature may be perfect in itself, all men have not the means of knowing it perfectly. To this Tindal answers, that all men have sufficient knowledge for the circumstances in which they are placed. A sincere desire to know the Divine will must always make men acceptable to God. He cannot require more than that men should strive to the best of their ability to know what is right, and to follow it. We are to reach this knowledge by means of the faculties by which we are distinguished from the brutes. By these faculties we know that there is a God, what are His laws, and that we are to be accountable for them. Whatever He requires us to believe and practise must be in itself a reasonable service. As the eye is given to see what is visible, and the ear to hear what may be heard, so is reason given to know the rational. Since God has bestowed upon all men a knowledge of those things which are hurtful to their bodies, it is not to be supposed that He has had less regard to their immortal souls. There is a clear and distinct light in natural reason which enlightens all men. Let them but attend to this light, and they shall perceive those eternal

But by a revelation to reason.

CHAP. XI.

truths which are the foundation of all knowledge. Archbishop Tillotson, Bishop Wilkins, and other writers of that school had maintained as a certain truth that there must be a law independent of the Scriptures, and previous to all external revelation; that by this law all men shall be judged and therefore it must be everywhere so plain as that no one can plead ignorance of it. Tindal takes it for granted that there is sufficient evidence that Jesus was sent from God to publish an external revelation, and he maintains that it is greatly to advance the honour of this revelation to show that it is in perfect agreement with the reason and the conscience.

The religion of nature.

The religion of nature, he says, is plain. It arises out of our relations to God and to each other. By considering these relations, we learn our duty, which is the practical part of religion. As God before creation was completely happy in Himself, He could have no motive in framing His creatures and giving them laws, but to promote their good. It follows from this that nothing can be a part of the Divine law which is not conducive to the common interest and mutual happiness of all rational creatures. He has so connected our present actions with our future happiness, that to sin against Him is to sin against ourselves. It is to act contrary to our rational nature. Reason teaches us that we are not to indulge our senses to the prejudice of either mind or body; that we are to moderate all our passions; that as we have a rational nature it must govern us. By obeying it, we must be fulfilling the will of Him, who, by thus connecting our happiness with reason, so plainly directs us to what is His will. There is implanted in man a love for his kind. The gratification of this leads to acts of benevolence, compassion, and good-will. These produce a pleasure which never satiates, while the contrary have for their natural fruits shame, confusion, and everlasting reproach. In no other way could God have more clearly revealed His will than by making everything within us and without us a declaration of it, and an argument for keeping it. In an external revelation it is impossible to lay down rules applicable to every particular case that may arise. There must be, on the supposition of our responsibility, some

standing rule discernible by the eyes of reason. Religion must in its essence be always and everywhere the same. Being founded on our relations to God, and our duties to each other, it must be immutable. One jot or tittle of this eternal law can never be abrogated or changed.

The rational life a righteous life.

To live up then to the dictates of our rational nature constitutes the only true and lasting well-being. We have only one principle which can properly be called *innate*, and that is the desire for happiness. God has given us reason to discern what actions do or do not lead to this. Our nature is most perfect when it is most rational. The felicity of the Divine Being consists in His moral goodness. He follows the infallible dictates of His own reason. In imitating His purity and His rectitude we participate in His blessedness. We live the life of God. We become His children by a new birth, and are made perfect as our heavenly Father is perfect. It is our reason which constitutes the image of God within us. It is the bond which unites earth and heaven. Rational actions carry with them their own reward, and irrational their own punishment. There is no virtue which has not some good inseparably annexed to it, and no vice which does not necessarily carry with it some evil. It is true that in this life we are subject to diseases and disasters which often interfere with the natural results of well-doing. Yet even in this life to follow the dictates of right reason is to have an inward peace, and hereafter, when freed from the present imperfection, the happiness of rational, that is, of virtuous and righteous men, will be complete. It is not necessary to suppose that God, like a human lawgiver, has recourse to rewards and punishments. Good and evil having their foundations in the essential differences of things, joy, or suffering, follows as the natural and necessary result of our deeds. God has spoken plainly by the revelation in nature, which our reason can understand. It is impossible that He can tell us our duty by any book more plainly than He has done by natural reason. No book can give rules for every case that may arise in the ever-varying circumstances of our lives. Even the Gospel precepts cannot be followed according to the letter. To find their proper meaning we must go back to what the

CHAP. XI.

law of nature antecedently teaches to be our duty. No commands can alter the nature of things, or make that *fit* which in itself is *unfit*. External revelation must attend the utterances of right reason. It can only speak what reason speaks. If revelation required less than reason, it would be imperfect. If it required more, it would be tyrannical. The precepts of the Gospel, Dr. Barrow truly says, are no other than such as a physician prescribes for the health of our bodies, such as reason dictates. Tillotson says that 'all the precepts of Christianity are reasonable and wise, requiring such duties as are suitable to the light of nature;' and St. Augustine says, 'He that knows how to love God, and to regulate his life by that love, knows all that the Scripture propounds to be known.'

Punishment is for the good of the sinner.

The penalties annexed to the Divine laws, Tindal maintains, are for the good of mankind. They do good even to those who suffer. God does not punish men for their sins because He wants reparation. He cannot be injured, and, therefore, He can never require satisfaction. We make God in our own image when we think that He seeks worship and honour for His own sake. We cannot be profitable to God, nor is it any gain to Him that we are righteous. To represent Him as revengeful and wrathful is to clothe Him with human infirmity. If He could be made angry by the conduct of such wretched mortals as we are, He would never have a moment's peace; but He loves even when He punishes, for the object of punishment is not to leave the creature in a state of sin, which is inevitably a state of misery. With this view of punishment it is impossible that it can be never-ending, for endless punishment could not be for the good of the creature. Tillotson has well expressed himself on this subject, where he says, 'There is none can do a greater evil than the good he has done amounts to; and I think it next to madness to doubt whether extreme and eternal misery be not a greater evil than simple being is a good.'

Worship is for our benefit, not for God's.

It is not, Tindal continues, for God's sake, but for ours that He desires worship. This agrees with what we know of the Divine nature. Prayer is properly a contemplation of God's attributes—an acknowledgment of His great and

constant goodness. It serves to keep up a sense of our dependence on Him, and disposes us to imitate the perfections which we admire in Him. Le Clerc has said that 'nothing is more contrary to the nature of the Gospel than commands which have no relation to the good of mankind. Religion was revealed for us, and not for God.' Even the Sabbath Day was not for God, but for man. Tindal spoke of it as a great honour to the clergy of his time that they tried to teach the people humane and benevolent principles. Not long before, the only zeal which the people showed for religion was to hate every one that the priest hated. The end for which Christ came into the world was not to teach men new duties, but to teach them to repent of the breach of duties well known. There were the lost sheep, and those that were not lost, the sick, and those who did not require a physician. He came to save the lost, to heal the sick. His remedy was repentance and amendment. They that were whole had no need of repentance, but in every nation they that wrought righteousness were accepted of Him.

Natural and revealed religion the same in essence.

Natural and revealed religion having the same object, their precepts must be the same. Natural religion being perfect, what is revealed must be judged of by its agreement with natural religion. Whatever can be shown to tend to the natural good of the creature must be a superstructure that belongs to the law of nature. It is objected that the good of the creature and the honour of God may sometimes interfere with each other. Tindal answers that this is impossible. To glorify the Father is to let our light shine before men. The Father is glorified when the disciples of Jesus bear much fruit. We cannot love God and hate our brother. This identity of the human and the divine is one of the deepest lessons of cultivated reason. Marcus Aurelius has beautifully said, 'Thou wilt never do anything purely human in a right manner unless thou knowest the relation it bears to things divine, nor anything divine unless thou knowest all the ties it has to things human.' Man gives glory to God by following that reason, which is God's light in his soul, and by fulfilling the duties of this life he serves the end for which he was created. Bishop Sherlock is quoted at length as showing the identity

CHAP. XI.

of the religion of nature and external revelation. The necessity of the latter arises from the 'ignorance and superstition that had grown upon the world,' and the religion of the Gospel being 'the true original religion of reason and nature, it has a claim to be received *independent* of those miracles which were wrought in its confirmation.'

The cause of all superstition and all the evil that men have inflicted on each other in the name of religion is through neglecting what reason dictates concerning God. To prove this statement Tindal examines some of the practices of the ancient religions. Among those to be condemned he mentions circumcision. Had this been required by nature it would have been required always. He supposes that Abraham adopted it from the Egyptians, with a view to commend his posterity to their favour. It was not till God sent Moses into Egypt that *the Lord met him by the way in the inn, and sought to kill him for not circumcising his son.* Circumcision was not practised in the wilderness. But when the Israelites were encamped at Gilgal then the Lord said to Joshua, 'This day have I rolled away the reproach of Egypt from off you.' The custom of offering sacrifice is another evil enumerated among those that spring out of superstition. The heathen nations imagined that their deities were delighted with the butchering of animals, and that the *sweet smelling savour* atoned for their crimes. At first sacrifices were probably on religious festivities, or the commemoration of some national benefit. As men became more wicked, and the power of superstition stronger, they sacrificed beasts, and at length they offered human victims. But, in spite of these instances, reason still had its followers, who knew that God did not delight in the fat of rams, and that the acceptable sacrifice was a broken spirit and contrite heart. Ovid wrote—

Neglect of reason the cause of superstition.

'Nec bove mactato cœlestia numina gaudent,
Sed, quæ præstanda est et sine teste, fide.'

Tindal maintains that human sacrifices were sanctioned by the Levitical law, that Abraham was commended for being ready to offer up Isaac, and that Jephthah sacrificed his daughter. For this reason Jephthah is reckoned among Jewish heroes by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews;

nd Bishop Smalridge says 'that all the Fathers, as well as ur own homilies, own that he sacrificed his daughter.'

Divine laws never arbitrary.

As God never acts arbitrarily or interferes unnecessarily, He leaves human discretion to determine what means are most conducive to those things which are in their own nature obligatory. These means being changeable, in order to suit the different circumstances of different people nd nations, they are not of God's appointment in the same ense as are things eternal and immutable. It is not necesary that God should interpose with arbitrary commands. Everything of this kind that has been introduced into eligion has been made a handle for human imposition. We ave ample evidence of this in the history of the two sacraents instituted by Jesus. What could be more simple r more reasonable than these are; and yet there are men ho think that to sprinkle an infant with water is to save it, nd to eat bread and drink wine is mysteriously to eat flesh nd drink blood. To substitute for spiritual religion meats nd drinks, washings and sprinklings of blood and water, is nat to which the superstitious mind is always prone. The agans had their *Taurobolia*, in which they bedaubed a man a pit with the blood of a bull, which fell through the oles of a plank on which the beast was slain. And this as believed to wash away all his sins and to confer aptismal regeneration. The priests are attached to cereonies, and are generally the promoters of superstition; ut there are always men of sense who follow reason. actantius, a weak-brained Father of the Church, might y,—'Give us one that is unjust, foolish, and a sinner, nd in one instant he shall be just, prudent, and innoent; with one laver all his wickedness shall be washed way.' But Cicero, the Pagan philosopher, who was much earer the kingdom of God, said,—'Animi labes nec diuturitate evanescere, nec amnibus ullis elui potest.'

Positive religion less important than morality.

Tindal argues that to make religion consist in merely positive institutions is inconsistent both with the good of mankind and the honour of God. The happiness of society epends on the practice of morality. It is to be found that he more the mind is taken up with these religious obserances which are not of a moral nature, the less it attends

CHAP. XI.

to those which are. The Italian banditti are the most scrupulous observers of the external ordinances of the Church. In most places the substance of religion has been destroyed to make room for superstition, immorality, and persecution. There are even now in the best reformed Churches people who persuade themselves that God is wonderfully concerned about small things, trifling opinions, indifferent actions, the rites, modes, and appendages of religion. It has been observed that in our dealings with men we are seldom satisfied with the fullest assurance given us of their zeal for religion. If we are told that a man is religious, we still ask what are his morals. But if we hear that a man has honest principles, we seldom care to ask whether he be religious and devout. Tacitus observed in his time that 'men extremely liable to superstition are at the same time as violently averse to religion.' Tillotson says that 'men are apt to take to pacifying God by some external piece of religion,—such as were sacrifices among the Jews and heathens. The Jews pitched upon those that were most pompous and solemn, the richest and most costly. So that they might but keep their sins, they were well content to offer up anything else to God. They thought nothing too good for Him, provided He would not oblige them to become better. As to the Church of Rome, they are the most skilful people in the world to pacify God. Shall I go before a crucifix to bow myself to it as the Most High God? To which of the saints or angels shall I go to mediate for me and intercede on my behalf? Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of Paternosters or Ave Maries? Shall the host travel in procession, or myself take a tedious pilgrimage? or shall I list myself a soldier for the Holy War? Shall I give my estate to a convent, or chastise and punish my body for the sin of my soul?' The heathen priests made the chief part of their religion to consist in gaudy shows and pompous ceremonies. The Mahometans make a pilgrimage to Mecca the highest act of their religion. To make void the moral law by vain tradition, and that under pretence of serving the temple, is an old error of men who sacrifice the substance of religion in clinging to the shadow. 'What vile things,' Tindal says, 'has not the abused

Superstition is the enemy of religion.

ame of the Church patronized? Nay, even in the best onstituted Church have we not lately heard mention of men ɔnd of the name of High Church, whose religion chiefly con- isted in drinking for the Church, cursing, and swearing, nd lying for the Church, raising riots, tumults, and sedi- ion, in favour of a Popish Pretender, and all for the secu- ity of the Protestant Church of England; or in believing hat those who go to places with steeples can never be in he wrong, and that those who go to places without them an never be in the right?' 'It is happy,' Tindal adds, for the laity that they can fall back upon reason and sense nd be independent of the traditional religion of the priests. To uphold their traditional religions in that which they are raditional, which is the positive or mutable parts, has been he temptation in all ages to depart from rectitude of heart nd conduct. Daillé says that the Holy Fathers in their ontroversial writings did not think themselves obliged to peak the truth, but that everything was lawful which served o gain the victory. Scaliger says that the primitive Chris- ians put all things into their books which they thought would help Christianity. St. Hilary says that since the Council of Nice we have done nothing but make creeds,— we make creeds every year, yea, every moon. It is a just emark of Uriel Acosta, "that when men depart ever so ittle from natural religion, it is the occasion of great strifes nd divisions; but if they recede much from it, who can de- lare the calamities which ensue?" The heroes of old, nstructed by the philosophers, learnt to look on the in- rinsic loveliness of virtue, and the utter deformity of vice. They were taught in their actions to be guided by the com- non good. But now the good of the Church is set up in pposition to the common good. It has even been main- ained that vice is lovely, and virtue unlovely,—that barring the consequence of a future state, they would act like fools who did not indulge themselves in a vicious course. Bishop Atterbury in a sermon has endeavoured to prove that *in this life the virtuous man is most miserable.* There are two ways which never fail to make superstition prevail—mys- teries to amuse the enthusiasts, especially the pretenders to deep learning, and all that admire what they do not under-

Often destructive of morality.

Creeds and rites substituted for religion.

CHAP. XI.

stand; and gaudy shows and pompous ceremonies to bewitch the vulgar.'

The Church of Rome, Tindal says, has made the most of these, and by them has weakened the force of Christianity in the hearts and lives of men. The Quakers are most averse to ceremony, and among them religion seems to have made the deepest impression. To magnify revelation some men weaken the force of the religion of reason and nature. But this is to strike at the root of all religion. For the government of human actions there cannot be two independent rules. It may be objected that reason is fallible, and revelation infallible. To this the answer is, that whatever is true by reason can never be false by revelation. To suppose anything in revelation inconsistent with reason, is to destroy all rational proof for the truth of religion. If our reasoning faculties, duly attended to, deceive us, we have no certainty for anything, but can only float on a shoreless sea of scepticism. To weaken the force of reason in order to magnify tradition, is to sap the foundation in order to support the superstructure. So long as reason is against men, they will be against reason. We see men trying to reason people out of their reason, which is a demonstration that we really have nothing to trust to in the end but reason as the final judge or arbiter. It is the highest commendation that we can give to religion, to say that it is a reasonable service. There are self-evident notions, which are the foundation of all our reasonings. Without these there could be no intellectual communication between God and man. As we are constituted, God cannot assure us of any truth but by showing its agreement with these self-evident notions. Revelation in any other way than by the light of nature, can only come under the head of probability; and the probability of facts depending on human testimony, must gradually lessen in proportion to the distance of time when they were done. The internal excellency of the Scriptures is the main proof of their coming from God. 'For my part,' says Chillingworth, 'I profess if the doctrine of the Scripture was not as good and as fit to come from God, the fountain of goodness, as the miracles by which it was confirmed were great, I should want one main pillar of my faith; and for want of it,

Reason infallible.

By reason we know that the Scriptures come from God.

fear, should be much staggered in it.' We cannot be governed both by reason and authority. The one must bend to the other. 'It is,' Tindal says, 'an odd jumble to prove the truth of a book by the truth of the doctrine it contains, and at the same time conclude these doctrines to be true because contained in that book.' We can have no fuller evidence of the sovereignty of reason than this, that when there is anything in a traditional religion which cannot be defended by reason, we have recourse to any method of interpretation, however forced, to make it appear reasonable.

We can only judge of a religion by its internal marks or by miracles wrought in evidence of its truth. But miracles may be false miracles as well as true, and they may be performed by evil beings as well as by good. It was a proverbial saying among the philosophers of Greece, that 'miracles are for fools, and reason for wise men.' The Bœotians were remarkable for their stupidity and the number of their oracles. In the Christian world, ignorance and the belief of daily miracles go hand in hand. Scripture everywhere asks for examination. It calls reason 'the inspiration of the Almighty.' Isaiah represents God as inviting the people of Israel to come and reason with Him. Job says, 'I desire to reason with God.' St. Paul 'reasoned' in the synagogue; 'reasoned with the Jews out of the Scripture;' 'reasoned (before Felix) of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come.' Had men kept to reason, there would never have been any occasion for external revelation; and its great use now is, to lead men to observe those laws which make for their happiness both in the present life and in that which is to come. Tindal never denies the necessity of an external revelation. He admits the deplorable condition of the heathen world, but he does not admit that they are without the means of recovery. They have the same eternal law of reason which Christians have. Let them follow it, and they will be saved. It is objected that reason could never make known to us that there are three persons in the Godhead. Tindal answers that he does not profess to understand the 'orthodox paradoxes.' He will only say that he does not disbelieve them. He cannot have any faith which does not bear the test of reason. A

The Scriptures appeal to reason,

CHAP. XI.

book cannot be a guide to override reason. If it is figurative, or difficult to understand, so far it requires reason to interpret it. Athanasius says of the Bible, that if we understand a great part of it literally, we shall fall into the most enormous blasphemies. St. Gregory says, 'The Scriptures are not only dead, but deadly, for it is written, *the letter killeth.*' To lay stress on reason is not to set aside revelation, but rather, if the revelation be reasonable, to establish it. Whichcot does justice to external revelation. He says, 'The Scripture way of dealing with men in matter of religion is always by evidence of reason and argument.' He adds, Tindal says very judiciously, 'I reckon that which has not reason in it, or for it, is man's superstition. and not religion of God's making.' Bishop Hoadly calls authority the greatest and most irreconcilable enemy to truth and argument that the world ever furnished. 'It was authority,' the Bishop says, 'which hindered the voice of the Son of God Himself from being heard, and which alone stood in opposition to His powerful arguments and His divine doctrine.' As to some things being above reason, Tindal answered nearly in the words of Collins, that if he does not understand the terms of a proposition—if they are inconsistent with each other, or so uncertain that he does not know what meaning to fix upon them,—there is nothing told, and consequently no room for belief.

And can be tested by reason.

There must be, Tindal declares, in the multitude of mankind, ability to distinguish between religion and superstition. If not, men can never extricate themselves from the errors in which they were born. External proofs are beyond the multitude. They will never be convinced of the true religion but by its internal evidence. There are many things in the historical parts of the Scripture which cannot be literally true, and, consequently, the truth of religion cannot depend upon them. The common people must judge of the truth of Scripture by its internal marks, for they have not the capacity to enter into the innumerable disputes that require time and learning. God is sometimes represented as falsifying, not only His word, but His oath. The Old Testament prophecies are very difficult of interpretation, and some in the New Testament were never fulfilled, proving that those who uttered

Internal evidence surer than external.

hem were in error. The only reasonable course left is to ake all for Divine Scripture which tends to the honour of God and the good of man. And this was really what St. Paul did, as Grotius rightly interprets the passage, that no Scripture is divinely inspired unless profitable for doctrine, eproof, correction, and instruction in righteousness. A atural revelation is direct from God; a traditional is one vhich we have on testimony. When they are different, and ve follow the traditional, to the neglect of the rational, we re like that prophet in the Book of Kings, who was per-uaded by an old prophet to disobey the voice of the Lord, nd for his disobedience was slain by a lion, which met him n the way, as he departed from Bethel.

Tindal and Samuel Clarke.

In the last chapter of 'Christianity as Old as Creation,' Tindal opposed some of the propositions laid down by Samuel Clarke in his Boyle Lectures on the 'Truth and Certainty of he Christian Religion.' As Clarke was one of the divines vho laid the foundations of religion and morality in the un-hangeable relations of reason and the natural fitness of hings, it is here that we come nearest to a correct under-tanding of Tindal's views of Christianity. On the excel-ency of natural religion Clarke had spoken as decidedly as Tindal had done. He pronounced the law of nature a per-ect law, and he said almost in the words of Cudworth, that the eternal and unchangeable nature and reason of things hemselves are the laws of God, not only to His creatures, ut also to Himself, as being the rule of His own actions in he government of the world.' And this unchangeable law nust always be the will and command of God to all His ational creation. Bishop Cumberland, in a passage quoted y Clarke, calls it 'that law of nature to which the reason of ll men everywhere as naturally and necessarily assents, as ll animals conspire in the pulse and motion of their hearts nd arteries, or as all men agree in their judgment concern-ng the whiteness of snow or the brightness of the sun.' After drawing out a consistent scheme of natural religion, Clarke says, 'now that Christianity has come, what was once a consistent scheme of Deism is so no longer.' Tindal nswers, that if it was a consistent scheme once, it cannot e made inconsistent by revelation. Either it is the same as

Deism a consistent scheme before Christianity.

CHAP. XI.

revelation, and in that case it stands, or it is different from revelation, and then it must stand, for the certainty of natural religion is greater than that of any external revelation can be. If the doctrines of reason are as evidently the will of God as that the sun is bright, it is impossible for the Deists to believe on the less evidence when they have the greater. Faith is here swallowed up in knowledge, and probability is lost in certainty. It is not likely that Clarke would have objected to what Tindal says of the certainty of natural religion, and he might have admitted its advantage in this respect over an external revelation; but when Clarke said that there was not now a consistent scheme of Deism, he did not mean precisely what Tindal understood him to mean. The argument, as propounded in his first discourse, is that Christianity so accords with reason, that whoever believes in natural religion must also receive the Gospel. It was the argument of Lactantius to the Pagan philosophers, that if they continued to follow reason and philosophy, they must become Christians. There was no alternative but absolute Atheism, for the same difficulties and objections that are in the way of believing the doctrines of the Gospel, lie equally against the doctrines of Deism.

So far Tindal and Clarke, if the terms had been properly defined, would probably have agreed; but after Clarke has said that some doctrines are in their own nature necessarily and demonstrably true, and others necessarily false, he adds, 'that other doctrines are in their own nature *indifferent* or *possible*, or perhaps *probable* to be true, and these could not have been known to be positively true but by the evidence of miracles which prove them to be certain.' Here Tindal objects that as God never acts arbitrarily, on Clarke's own principles, there can be no doctrines *indifferent*. Every one of the doctrines of the Christian religion, Clarke says, has a 'natural tendency, and a direct powerful influence to reform men's lives, and correct their manners,' and he pronounces it a great and fatal mistake to think that any doctrine or any belief whatever can be any otherwise of any benefit to man than as it is fitted to promote this end. Some of the doctrines of Jesus were possibly or very probably true, yet we could not be assured of them without a revelation con-

Yet insufficient.

med by miracles. Tindal objects that to distinguish be- reen the moral part of Christianity and that which tends to omote the honour of God and the practice of righteousness, to make a distinction without a difference, and he endea- ours to show that, to make room for external revelation, Clarke contradicts what he has already said of the certainty of tural religion. In the original uncorrupted state of human ture, right reason, Clarke says, was a sufficient guide; t after mankind had fallen, they required supernatural sistance. He expresses this strongly, saying that a divine evelation was absolutely necessary for the recovery of man- nd. Tindal takes this to mean that without an external re- lation men were under an absolute impossibility of recovery om the universal corruption and degeneracy into which ey had fallen. If this be the right interpretation, it is to ppose that for 4000 years God left men without the means knowing their duty, and yet expected them to do it. If e light of revelation did not come till a late age in the rld, and it commanded things not commanded by the light nature, we must conclude that until that time it was not cessary for God to command them, nor expected of men do them. Yet Clarke, according to Tindal, makes the ght of nature and right reason altogether insufficient to store true piety, laying the fault not in man, but in the ght of nature, which at one time, he says, 'nowhere ap- ared,' and at another time that it 'has undeniable defects it.' In another place Clarke says, 'Even those few extra- dinary men of the philosophers who did sincerely endea- our to reform mankind, were themselves entirely ignorant some doctrines absolutely necessary for bringing about e great end of the reformation and recovery of mankind.' he whole attempt to discover the truth of things, and to struct others therein, was like 'wandering in the wide a, without knowing whither to go, or which way to take, having any guide to conduct them.' Tindal supposes this mean that the heathen were left without the means of ing saved, and pronounces Dr. Clarke's scheme as less erciful than that of the Predestinarians. In all ages the redestinarian believed there were some elect, but here men e inextricably involved in depravity, corruption, and im-

Perplexity of the philoso- phers.

CHAP. XI.

piety. Against this conclusion Tindal urges that the Pag world was under no necessity of being in such darkness a ignorance, for that which may be known of God was manif enough in all ages. No age indeed could know more God than was knowable, but all men have had sufficient lig to teach them their duty, and by that light shall be reward or condemned. They who followed the corruptions of t heathen world did not do it in perfect ignorance. Th knew the judgment of God, that *they who did such things a worthy of death.* God has given every man a plain rule f his conduct. An ignorant man may not know so much the learned Rector of St. James's, yet he may know what sufficient for him. Clarke says that the philosophers we ignorant of the whole scheme, order, and state of thing

Uncertainty even under the gospel.

Tindal answers that we are in the same ignorance still. T things to which Clarke referred were the Bible accounts o the fall of man and the scheme of restoration by means of a Redeemer. Tindal replies that the philosophers wou scarcely have been satisfied with the stories of Adam a Eve, the serpent tempting them, and the Lord God walki in the garden in the cool of the evening; and as to knowing how to be restored to God's favour, Tindal answered with Locke, that all men know this was to be done by repentance and amendment.

Tindal calls himself a Christian Theist.

The arguments of 'Christianity as Old as Creation' were really directed against Tindal's former friends, the High Churchmen. He calls himself a Christian Theist, and nowhere denies the supernatural character of external revelation. His adversaries attributed to him many indirect designs against religion, but the only ostensible and really tangible object of his book was to show that the essence of Christianity did not consist in any positive institutions or precepts. Whether or not there were any positive institutions of Divine appointment was a further question; but the multitude of ecclesiastical precepts, and the ceremonies which constituted the religion of most Christians, he declared to have no authority. They were the inventions of the clergy, and tended only to keep the people in superstition. Christianity is a reasonable service—the religion of a sound mind.

CHAP. XI.

Tindal's opponents were very numerous, and, what is very markable, the ablest of them were of the rational or latidinarian school. Scarcely one High Churchman appeared ainst him. Dr. Stebbing wrote a defence of Clarke's idences. He reasoned keenly, but he was not above worthy insinuations as to Tindal's ulterior object. When ndal praised Clarke's lectures, Stebbing said it was only artifice, meaning that Christianity was not capable of fence. He would confine himself to that part of the gument which concerned the use and advantages of the ospel revelation. He maintained that Clarke had followed e Apostles in laying the foundation of Christianity in tural religion, which is binding on the consciences of all en antecedent to any revelation. St. Paul referred to the w of nature when he said that the grace of God, which ingeth salvation, appeared unto all men. We are to gard the Gospel as a remedy for our apostasy. It is no sparagement to the Gospel, Stebbing said, to consider it an instrument to restore natural religion; and Tindal admitted that it was no disparagement to natural religion that e Gospel supports it, but the Gospel offers a remedy which as not offered in natural religion. The main question at sue between Clarke and Tindal is to reconcile what Clarke ys of the perfection of the law of nature with the defects ascribes to it. Stebbing was to prove that revelation was deed necessary. It is not evident that Tindal denied this the sense in which Stebbing uses the word *necessary*. tebbing's explanation of Clarke is that he reasoned of the cessity of revelation from the actual condition of mankind. indal ridiculed the Bible account of the fall, but he did ot deny that men were in great ignorance, and that any eans of instructing them how to rise out of it were useful, sirable, and so necessary. He admitted, too, that the ospel, being a reasonable religion, was well fitted for this ject. Stebbing denies that Clarke laid the fault on the w, and not on mankind. He admitted right reason to be sufficient guide before the mind of man was depraved; nt it is not now sufficient for the bulk of mankind, because the force of corruption, though, even in spite of this rruption, some few in all ages have discovered plain moral

Dr. Stebbing against Tindal.

He explains and defends Clarke's meaning.

CHAP. XI. duties. Stebbing goes on to show that Clarke and Tindal do not differ on this subject,—that Clarke's account of the light of nature is that it is clear and strong, but not irresistible, and that Tindal says the same thing. No rational creature can be ignorant of natural religion who attends to the dictates of his own mind. Stebbing denies that Clarke ever said the heathen were invincibly ignorant. His position is, that the general wickedness and darkness of men were so great that they needed further instruction. Clarke's views are explained in a passage which he quotes from Cicero, 'as in physic, it matters nothing whether a disease be such as that no man *does*, or no man *can recover* from it; so in the present case there is no difference, whether men *cannot reform* themselves, or whether they *will not*.' With the adroitness of a controversialist Stebbing turns on Tindal's doctrine of *sincerity*, and charges him with making it equivalent to keeping the moral law, thus advancing the grossest Pagan errors to an equality with Christian faith and morality, and making a state of ignorance as good as a state of knowledge—a consequence which certainly was not in any way implied by what Tindal said.

Doctrines necessary to salvation.

Clarke spoke of some doctrines unknown to the philosophers as absolutely necessary for the recovery of mankind. Tindal answered that these must either be doctrines of natural religion, or that they were not absolutely necessary for the recovery of mankind. Stebbing says that these doctrines were (1) the manner in which God might be acceptably worshipped, and (2) the method by which such as have erred from the right way and have offended God may yet again restore themselves to His favour. Here the objection is plainly against the light of nature. It is not a sufficient guide for man in his present ignorance and corruption. But these doctrines concern man as a fallen being. They reveal a way of recovery. Difficulties arise which the original law is not able to explain. Revelation is an explanation of them. Doctrines, which had no relation to man as an innocent being, may be important to him as a sinner. They may be said to be beyond or outside of the law of nature, yet their tendency was not to mend or perfect the original law, but to influence the behaviour of

ın for good, and to bring them back to the duties of tural religion. God has promised forgiveness on condi- ın of repentance, and He has told us to perform acts of ırship, the effect of which is to confirm faith, and be helps virtue. This is Stebbing's explanation of the doctrines vealed in the Gospel.

What is Christianity?

The controversy becomes finally a question of what Chris- ınity is. Is it, as Tindal says, co-extensive with natural re- ıion, neither more nor less; or does it, as Sherlock, Clarke, d Stebbing maintain, include doctrines peculiar to itself, ıich, though not different from the principles of reason d nature—that is, do not really contradict them—yet are stinct from them? Sherlock said, in explanation of the ry words on which Tindal fastened, that there were some stitutions in the Gospel which in their own nature are no nstituent parts of religion. Their object is to confirm d strengthen our hope in God, but not to supply the fects of natural religion. The positive institutions of ıristianity are only instruments, but not, on that account, ebbing says, to be called arbitrary commands. There are ıristian institutions which, if Christianity were taken ay, would have no meaning,—such, for instance, as the mmemoration of the Last Supper. The same is true of ıat are called the speculative truths of the Gospel, such as e doctrine of reconciliation. It is true also of some prac- ıes which arise out of certain doctrines which show us ıties that would not have been duties if the Gospel had not mmanded them. They are not *indifferent* doctrines as gards use, but they are without natural obligation. The e tangible doctrine which must be made the test of the ntroversy is that which concerns the method of the ivine forgiveness. Tindal concluded that as the Pagan ırld placed it in repentance and amendment, they were ıt ignorant of the way of salvation. Stebbing goes into a ng argument to prove that we cannot conclude on the ere ground of the Divine goodness that God will forgive n. He disputed the truth of the statement of Locke, that od, who is rich in mercy, will forgive His frail offspring if ey acknowledge their faults, and strive to conform their tions to the law of nature. Stebbing says there may be a

CHAP. XI.

scheme or order of things of which we are not compete judges. In this order it may be a necessity that just require satisfaction, and that goodness be directed by w dom. On this supposition a scheme of reconciliation mu be *revealed*. Tindal argues that if the knowledge of tl scheme is absolutely necessary to salvation, then it ought be made known to all men. Stebbing answers that perha the reason for the want of universality cannot be give Revelation being an act of mercy, not of justice, God is liberty to give it to whom He will. This, however, Tinc never denied, except on the understanding that these r vealed doctrines were absolutely necessary to salvation. that case the man who never had the means of recove would have a right to complain not only of the want of I vine mercy but also of Divine justice.

John Balguy writes against Tindal.

Another writer of the rational school who replied w Tindal was Balguy. He had already written against Shafte bury in 'A Letter to a Deist.' He now writes agair Tindal, 'A Second Letter to a Deist.' He says the bo should have been called—Christianity Older than the Cr tion; or, rather, 'Christianity Before all Ages.' The t main pillars of Tindal's scheme he finds to be, (1) That t law of nature is perfect and unchangeable; (2) That all men are naturally capable of discovering it. The inference he supposes to be made is, that the Gospel is needless, and all revelation superfluous. The second is not a very acc rate expression of Tindal's doctrine, and the inference Balguy's, not Tindal's. It is agreed that as man is ignorance he requires instruction. Temperance and exercise constitute a good rule of health: but it does not follow that physic and the physicians are useless. The light nature might give men hopes that repentance would produ some good effect; but what this effect might be was beyond the power of men to describe. They wanted deliverance from the penalty as well as from the power of sin. Moral and Divine truths are discoverable by our unassisted faculties, as the lights of heaven are seen by the naked ey The Gospel, like the telescope, brings them nearer. Tindal's question, if God had not enabled all mankind, ev those who never heard of the Gospel, to obtain as much lig

ıd knowledge as are sufficient to the discharge of their ıty, Balguy answers decidedly, without a scruple or hesi-tion, in the affirmative. It cannot possibly, he says, be ıy man's duty to do what is not in his power to know. Whoever improves his knowledge as much as he can, and actises accordingly, is sure to discharge his duty. In ıis sense and in this respect no one wants light. Balguy nounces what he calls the absurd doctrine of hereditary uilt; but he acknowledges the actual fact of human cor-ıption, and this in connection with original guilt. Whatever, he says, wounds or weakens the root, must naturally ırt the branches. The light, however, was not extin-ıished. The chief lines of duty remain visible to all men ıless they wilfully shut their eyes. Still the light of reason not sufficient to bring men to that standard of duty hich belongs to their nature, and that state of perfection f which they are capable. But even if it were, revelation, ıough less needful and less expedient, would still not be seless. And this, according to Balguy, is all for which larke contended,—that the generality of men stood in need more light and better instruction. Clarke never even by ference complained of the want of perfection in the light nature. He was too wise to charge God foolishly. uring the four thousand years that preceded the incarna-on, the world, he said, had the benefits of the Gospel, ıough ignorant of the name. It is no objection against ıe light of nature that so many were in darkness, any more ıan it is against the Gospel that so many are still unen-ghtened by it. Clarke regarded all virtuous men in all ges as among God's elect, and not, as Tindal supposed he id, in a state of perdition because they were without ıternal revelation.

Explains Clarke;

Christianity, Balguy says, neither abrogates nor discoun-nances the least tittle of the law of nature; on the con-ary, it sets the whole in the clearest light, and earnestly commends and inculcates the observation of it. The hristian has many advantages over the Pagan. On the ıpposition that Tindal questioned the right of the Divine eing to give to some men greater favours than He gives others, Balguy reasons that this is perfectly within the

And maintains the agreement of Christianity with natural religion.

CHAP. XI.

province of the Divine Will. Christians may have positi as well as natural advantages in the life to come over t heathen. There are many mansions in our Father's hous and in these many ranks and degrees may be as fitting they are on earth. Such distinctions may contribute to th order and perfection of the heavenly state. The body faithful believers may be distinguished by a regard their meritorious Head. Balguy objects to Tindal's definitions both of Deism and Christianity. They do not, he says, consist in being governed by moral fitness. This is moral virtue, and may be the guide of an Atheist as well as of a Deist or a Christian. Deism is, to be governed by th obligations of natural religion, and natural religion consist in obedience to the will of God as made known by the ligh of nature and reason. Christianity is obedience to the sam will as made known in the revelation of Jesus Christ. Religion obliges men to do actions, not because of moral fitness, but because they are commanded. The primary idea of religion is obedience to the *will* of God.

Conybeare replies to Tindal,

Dr. John Conybeare, Rector of Exeter College, in Oxford, and afterwards Bishop of Bristol, wrote 'A Defence of Revealed Religion against the Exceptions of a late Writer in his Book entitled "Christianity as Old as Creation."' This work was dedicated to Edmund, Bishop of London, who had also written against the Deists. Conybeare contrasted the spirit of the Bishop's writings with those of the Deists, pronouncing the latter 'remarkable for an entire contempt of decency.' Tindal's great design, he said, was to prove that there neither hath been, nor can possibly be, any revelation at all; and that the main principle on which he builds is, that the light of common reason is sufficient without it. According to Conybeare, Tindal concludes that all information this way must be entirely superfluous and unworthy of God, because useless and unprofitable to man. There is a distinction to be noticed between doctrines and precepts or duties. They are both, Conybeare says, to be included under religion; for, though distinct, they are connected, many of the duties arising from belief of the doctrines. Another distinction is to be made in what is meant by religion of nature. It may either be what is

ounded in the reason and nature of things, or it may be what is discernible by our faculties. In the former case, it s such a collection of moral doctrines and precepts as have a rational foundation; in the latter, only such a collection as *we have been able to discover* by the exercise of our faculties according to the means and opportunities we enjoy. Conybeare says that Tindal was not ignorant of this distinction, but that he confounds it in his argument. Natural religion is *to us* only that which may be known by *our* reason. There are perfections belonging to God of which we have not complete or adequate ideas. Supposing it demonstrable that God is just and good, yet there may be occasions of which we are not judges in what way His justice and goodness are to be exercised. Again, there may be distinctions in the Divine nature analogous to personal distinctions among men. If so, each person may have different offices, and a different relation to mankind, so that there will be something in the Divine nature not discernible by human reason. This is what the Christian religion teaches. In consequence of this, there are things required in Christianity which our faculties could not have discovered by the light of reason.

And shows the necessity of revelation.

Conybeare notices that Tindal sometimes speaks of the law of nature as the will of God, and at other times as the moral fitness of things. This was done by all the great writers on morals of that age, but Conybeare objects to speak of any obligation as antecedent to the will of God, and especially of God Himself as the subject of obligation. The notion of law, he argues, refers to some superior, as the author of law. It is only in the light of a command from God that it is either a law or a religion. Though expressing his dissent from both Clarke and Tindal on this subject, Conybeare guards his remark with a declaration of his faith in the truth and certainty of the religion of nature. Referring to his former definition of the law of nature as embracing only what is discoverable by our faculties, Conybeare says that it will be in vain to reply that all men have means of knowledge sufficient for the circumstances in which they are placed. Yet he admits that if Tindal only means that a just and merciful God will judge men according to the

Makes law to depend on the will of God.

CHAP. XI.

opportunities they have had, in this sense every man has sufficient means of knowledge. But this, he maintained, was not the question at issue. The question, in Conybeare's judgment, was whether every man is capable of knowing all things that are of real moment to him, and he proceeds to show that, though in all ages men have hoped that a good and merciful God will forgive, yet hope is not certainty. We cannot conclude by mere human reason that pardon will certainly follow on repentance; there may be something in the constitution of things to us unknown which possibly may not admit of absolute pardon. But when God declares that pardon is offered in view of something accepted by Him as a satisfaction, then the point is clear. As the law of reason and nature can reach no further than human reason can carry us, this law or religion Conybeare argues, must so far fail, and therefore it is not, as Tindal contends, absolutely perfect.

What God does cannot be arbitrary.

As to things indifferent, it is maintained that God may enjoin such, though neither relating to what is moral or natural—that is, having no direct reason in themselves. Such was the command to Naaman to wash seven times in Jordan. For God to act from mere will or pleasure is not to act arbitrarily. He does not thereby violate moral rules. There are things which He must do out of mere will, such as creating the world at a certain time. There are things in religion which are fit and proper for the occasion, such as the institution of the Last Supper. Positive precepts may be useful for a trial of our faith, patience, and obedience. It is, however, admitted that it is to positive precepts that superstition invariably clings. There is a natural tendency in the multitude of men to consider things merely positive as in themselves excellent, and in their own nature moral. The popular mind mistakes means for ends, and often takes mere human rites as of divine institution, and invariably gives them too much importance, whether divine or human. This was substantially what Tindal said; but Conybeare, like all Tindal's adversaries, thought he meant more than he said. His real sentiments, Conybeare says, are, that there is no such thing as revealed religion, and that Christianity in particular is a gross imposture; that,

n the one hand, there is no occasion for a revelation; and, on the other, there is no sufficient proof that such a revelation has ever been made at all. Conybeare returns, towards the end, to his favourite distinction between the will of God and the nature of things, and declares that for his life he cannot see how the performance of what is right, without considering it as the will of God, can be obedience to God. He objects to the word *revelation* being applied to that knowledge which we have by reason. As well, he says, may we speak of mathematical or natural philosophy as a revelation. He maintains that only that is revealed which we have on the authority of a revealer. We may not *know* it, for it may not come under the cognizance of our self-evident notions, as Tindal called them, but we may have assurance of it. The proofs of revelation, he admits, may be only probabilities, but it is by probabilities that we are guided in life. Morality itself, though demonstrable, can only be reasoned out by a very few. The greater part of mankind must believe in morality on evidence which is only probable. And to Tindal's three objections that Christianity was not made known before the time of Tiberius, that it was not given all at once, and that it was not made to all persons, Conybeare answers that objections of the same kind, and as difficult to be answered, may be brought against natural religion.

Dr. Leland replies to Tindal.

Dr. John Leland, the indefatigable opponent of the whole generation of the Deists, wrote 'An answer to a book entitled Christianity as Old as Creation.' Leland undertook to prove that Tindal's scheme is inconsistent with reason and with itself, and that it was injurious to the interests of virtue and the good of mankind. By Christianity, he says, Tindal did not mean what any one else means, the whole of that revelation published by Christ and His Apostles, but simply what is called the religion of nature. His chief objections—those which formed the largest scope for declamation—are such as lie not so much against Scripture or external revelation as against Providence, and are therefore the same difficulties for which the Deist has to account in his scheme as those which meet the believer in revelation. Leland, like all Tindal's adversaries, found that

CHAP. XI.

though he pretended to believe both internal and external revelation, his belief in the latter was only feigned for the occasion. The title of the book ought to have been *Christianity not as Old as Creation, and therefore false.* Leland urged, as Stebbing and Conybeare had done, that the state of man as a creature fallen from God, required light and help beyond what were given by natural religion. And as to positive commands, he saw no difficulty in believing that God might enjoin many things the reason of which we do not at present see. Many of the positive institutions in the Levitical economy had a reason in themselves which even now we can discover. Some of them were to keep the people separate from the surrounding nations, some were commemorative of past deliverances, and others figures of good things to come. The Christian sacraments need never be prejudicial to the end for which they were instituted, if men would but keep them as they were intended; and so with all symbolical representations, if they are limited to those appointed by God, they may be useful and the danger of superstition avoided. Leland says the question between him and Tindal is—whether all men have by natural light or reason such knowledge as that no external revelation can make it clearer. Supposing this to be Tindal's position, Leland wishes to show the insufficiency of the light of reason. He rejects the test of moral actions drawn from their tendency to promote the general good, on the ground that men are not agreed as to what makes for the general good. Is it for the general good that one man should have only one wife? Plato recommended a community of wives. Is it for the general good to destroy weak and sickly children as the Spartans did? Is self-murder, under some circumstances, for the general good? Is it true, as has been maintained, that 'private vices are public benefits'? The heathen guessed at a future life, but they were not assured of it. There was nothing to tell them that forgiveness followed on repentance. We do not know without revelation what is necessary for the vindication of Divine law. Locke's arguments for the connection between repentance and forgiveness are pronounced more ingenious than solid. As Tindal had connected all well being with well doing, Leland

Object of positive commands.

Insufficiency.

harges him with teaching the doctrine of selfish love, and contrasts this with the disinterested morality of the Gospel. What Tindal calls speculative doctrines and speaks of as useless, Leland makes the essence of Christianity, such as the mediation of Christ and His death as a sacrifice for sin. He includes among the doctrines of Christianity the birth, death, resurrection, and ascension of Jesus, and he asks how any man who rejects these can be said to believe the Scriptures on account of the doctrines. The facts of Christianity are connected with its doctrines and must depend on testimony. Authority in such a case is the only kind of proof available.

There were many other replies to Tindal of various degrees of merit. John Jackson, Rector of Rossington, in Yorkshire, wrote 'Remarks on Christianity as Old as Creation.' This author states the object of Tindal's book with more accuracy and fairness than any of Tindal's opponents. 'The design,' he says, 'of this ingenious author, after showing the ground and principles of natural religion to be the eternal and immutable truth and reason of things which is the original will of God, and obligatory upon all rational agents, is to prove from thence that true revealed religion can be no other than a re-establishment of rational religion by an immutable and express *Divine authority*.' Thomas Cookman, Master of University College, Oxford, asserted and vindicated in answer to Tindal, 'Salvation by Jesus Christ alone.' He calls Tindal the head of those who lead young men into vice and irreligion. Cookman was eclipsed only by the anonymous author of 'The Conduct of the late Matthew Tindal, LL.D.,' where Tindal is designated 'the grand apostate and corrupter of the principles and morals of the youth of the present age.' He is called a wretch, an atheist, a renegade, and some other names too vile to be mentioned here. The replies to Tindal, taking them altogether, were unsatisfactory. This may have been owing to a want of definiteness as to the object of his book. It was diffuse in its style, abounding in long quotations, and many subjects were merely alluded to and left for future treatment. His opponents generally assumed that his object was to set aside the revelation in the Bible as useless,

John Jackson replies to Tindal.

CHAP. XI.

and then they proceeded to show the darkness and ignorance of mankind, and consequently the necessity of revelation. To prove that a revelation was needed was not proving that a revelation was given, nor was it proving that the Bible contained that revelation, much less that the revelation itself consisted in the speculative doctrines of the Church, or the positive institutions of the Christian religion.

Bishop Gibson and Tindal.

Tindal left another volume of his book in manuscript, but it fell into the hands of the Bishop of London, who thought the best way to answer it was to destroy it. Bishop Gibson had made Tindal's work the subject of one of his 'Pastoral Letters.' He had said the same things against it as Tindal's other opponents, and he said them as well as they had been said by others. Gibson was a liberal Churchman as well as an assiduous bishop, and had some of the best qualities of the rational divines of his time, but the world will scarcely forgive him for destroying the work of one of the most thoughtful men of that age. On the monument erected to his memory in the vestibule of Fulham Church this is not recorded among his noble virtues and the great acts of his life. Could the deed speak it would say—

'Non ego sum titulis surripienda tuis.'

APPENDIX (A).

It is a matter of regret that the plan of this work necessarily gives greater prominence to controversial and even heretical writings than to the works of men whose lives were spent in the furtherance of practical religion. I have felt this in many cases, but in none more than in Chapter X., which is devoted to the religious literature of the Nonconformists. The controversial writings of Bunyan have occupied some pages, but there was no occasion to mention those to which he owes his immortality. For Matthew Henry, the most important Nonconformist writer after Bunyan, I have not found a place. His theology is sufficiently described by the word orthodox. The only controversial tract he wrote was on schism, the argument of which was that separation is not schism, which consists rather in uncharitableness and alienation of the affections. There may be, Matthew Henry says, schism where there is no separate communion, and there may be separate communion where there is no schism.

In the case of the Quakers this necessity of making prominent the controversial and heretical may seem as if I had put this community beyond the pale of the orthodox. I have tried to discover what was the teaching of the chief teachers among the early Quakers. After Fox I had only Penn and Barclay as really important writers. I do not at all enter on the question of the religious opinions of Quakers in the present day. I have been told by members of the Society of Friends that the prevailing doctrines are those known as evangelical, but that the variety of opinion is quite as great as in the Church of England. It is probable that there has always been among them a great diversity of sentiment, and perhaps at first they did not know that they differed. Penn has not been regarded as orthodox by some, and Barclay's book has no official authority. It is likely that most Quakers would give up any distinctive doctrine concerning the Spirit which interfered logically with the commonly received doctrine of the inspiration of the Scriptures. Those who did not would probably, as I have intimated, identify themselves with the liberal theologians of the Church of England, and make the light of the Spirit a 'verifying faculty' in the conscience. This, in my judgment, is the logical ultimate of the primitive Quaker doctrine of the Spirit. I have maintained that the Quakers held this doctrine in common with the Ranters, Seekers, Familists, and other half-mystical, half-rational sects of the Commonwealth era. It is

difficult to know what really were the doctrines of these sects. The accounts we have of them are only from enemies, and are sufficiently distorted. It seems, however, evident that they were dissatisfied with the current view of revelation, that it is something given long since and coming to us only by tradition. They wanted immediate revelation, and supposed perpetual and universal inspiration with the continuance of miracles. This exposed them, as it did the Quakers, at once to charges of enthusiasm and Deism. They were reckoned fanatics for supposing themselves inspired, and deniers of revelation, because they did not limit inspiration to the writers of the Bible.

Many volumes of sermons by Churchmen have been omitted which are of great value in themselves, as those of Dr. John Conant, one of the ejected ministers of 1662, and a leading Puritan at the Savoy Conference, but who conformed after seven years of nonconformity. I have omitted also the sermons of Dr. Claget, preacher at Lincoln's Inn, and the very excellent sermons of Hezekiah Burton, who died Rector of Barnes. Burton was a Cambridge man, and was chiefly known as a preacher. He was also a Canon of Norwich, and had been Rector of St. George's, Southwark. He died comparatively young, and had published nothing except a preface to Dr. Cumberland's 'De Legibus Naturæ.' His posthumous sermons were collected and edited by his friend Dr. Tillotson, who speaks of a long intimacy with him, and describes him as a man of great prudence and 'incomparable sweetness of temper.' The sermons are altogether practical, pervaded by a devout spirit, making very little of speculations about religion, but a great deal of religion itself. A good life is called 'the best and only religion,' and the best worship we can give to God is said to be 'to do good to men.' Again Burton says, 'In our beings we are like to God, our souls are rays from His sun, and in our virtues we are still more partakers of the divine nature.' The value of some creeds is described thus, 'Are there not articles of faith made by those who think they have the power of composing them, that are perfectly repugnant? *e.g.*, that God is good, and yet more cruel than the worst tyrant on earth. And faith and obedience which should conspire and assist each other mutually are made to clash and hinder each other in the religion that some men teach.' In the same sermon Burton says, 'Religion is no narrow, confined thing; it is not kept within the limits of a Church or a closet, nor is it determined to time, one or more days in seven to bow down the

head for a day; nor is it kept in the compass of some few exercises, such as praying and reading, and hearing and pondering, but it extends itself by a kind of omnipresence to all times and places in which we are, to all persons and things, and actions with which we converse. It is both in the shop and in the market, in the house and the field, in business and relaxations, in public as well as private, not only in devotions, but in our very divertisements and entertainments of ourselves. It is on the working as well as the resting and holy-days. It regulates our mirth as well as our sorrow, and directs and moderates our eating and drinking as well as our fastings and mournings.'

Of nearly the same character as Dr. Burton's sermons is the work of Henry Scougal, 'The Life of God in the Soul of Man.' Scougal was the son of Bishop Scougal, of Aberdeen, and was for four years Professor of Divinity in the university of that town, though he died at the early age of twenty-eight. This work was published by Bishop Burnet during the author's lifetime. Its object was to withdraw men's minds from contentions about religion to the practice of it, and to show that religion did not consist in what is called orthodox opinions or in the observance of external duties, but in a living 'union of the soul with God, a real participation of the divine nature.' Scougal describes religion as a life, because 'it is an inward force, a self-moving principle,' and those who have made progress in it 'are not,' he says, 'acted only by external motives, driven merely by threatenings, nor bribed by promises, nor constrained by laws, but are powerfully inclined to that which is good, and delight in the performance of it; the love which a pious man bears to God and goodness is not so much by virtue of a command enjoining him so to do, as by a new nature instructing and prompting him to do it;' nor doth he pay his devotions as an unavoidable tribute, only to appease the divine justice, and quiet his clamorous conscience, but those religious exercises are the proper emanations of the divine life, the natural employments of the new-born soul. The divine life rules in a righteous man, and faith is to him what sense is to a natural man. Religion and all that belongs to it have their certainty according to the strength of this inmost life. Scougal endorses the words of a saint who once said, 'I had rather see the real impressions of a God-like nature upon my own soul, than have a vision from Heaven, or an angel sent to tell me that my name were enrolled in the book of life.'

Among the evidence literature there is a work of some historical

interest by Dr. John Cockburn, published in 1697, called 'An Enquiry into the Nature, Necessity, and Evidence of Christian Faith.' The supposed enemies of Christianity are those who doubted the purity of the received text of the Bible, and those who said that a good life was of more importance than an orthodox faith. The first part is occupied with the theistic arguments, among which is one from the intellectual faculties in man, the omission of which Brougham notices in Paley.

A pamphlet by George Hickes on the passive obedience controversy, called 'The Story of the Thundering Legion,' could not be found till it was too late. A copy was discovered in the British Museum which had not been catalogued under the author's name. The story is that when Maximianus Cæsar ordered the Theban Legion to offer sacrifices to the gods at Octodurum, they fled to Agaunum. He sent after them, but they united with one voice to refuse. Maximianus then commanded every tenth man to be slain, which was done without the least resistance. Mauritius, the General of the Legion, thus addressed the soldiers, 'How fearful was I lest any of you being in arms, and therefore no hard matter to do it, should attempt the defending of yourselves, and by that means prevent a happy and most glorious death.' He went on to encourage them rather to submit to death than resist the Emperor. When every tenth man was slain the Emperor repeated his command to the survivors, and they all answered, 'We are, it is confessed, thy soldiers, O Cæsar, for the defence of the Roman Republic, nor have we ever proved either traitors or cowards, but this command of thine we cannot obey, for now we are all Christians, yet all our bodies shall be subject to thee.' Exuperius, their ensign, concludes thus, 'Despair itself hath not armed us against thee, O Emperor; behold we have all our weapons in our hands, and yet resist not, because we would rather die innocent than live nocent.' On this they were all put to death, not a man of them once offering to defend himself. This is the account given by Eucherius, and this conduct of the submissive legion was meant by Hickes for an example to the subjects of James II.

APPENDIX (B).

The Bishops from 1661 *to* 1720.

Canterbury.

Gilbert Sheldon	1663
William Sancroft	1678
John Tillotson	1691
Thomas Tenison	1694
William Wake	1715

St. Asaph.

Henry Glenham	1667
Isaac Barrow	1669
William Lloyd	1680
Edward Jones	1692
George Hooper	1703
William Beveridge	1704
William Fleetwood	1708
John Wynne	1714

Bangor.

Humphrey Lloyd	1673
Humphrey Humphreys	1689
John Evans	1701
Benjamin Hoadley	1715
Richard Reynolds	1721

Bath and Wells.

Robert Creighton	1670
Peter Mew	1672
Thomas Kenn	1685
Richard Kidder	1691
George Hooper	1703

Bristol.

Guy Carleton	1671
William Gulston	1678
John Lake	1684
Sir Jonathan Trelawney	1685
Gilbert Ironside	1689
John Hall	1691
John Robinson	1710
George Smalbridge	1714
Hugh Boulter	1719

Chichester.

Peter Gunning	1670
Ralph Brideoke	1675
Guy Carleton	1679
John Lake	1685
Simon Patrick	1689
Robert Grove	1691
John Williams	1696
Thomas Manningham	1709

St. David's.

William Thomas	1677
Lawrence Womack	1683
John Lloyd	1686
Thomas Watson	1687
[Vacant 5 years 8 months.]	
George Bull	1705
Philip Bisse	1710
Adam Ottley	1712

Ely.

Benjamin Laney	1667
Peter Gunning	1675
Francis Turner	1684
Simon Patrick	1691
John Moore	1707
William Fleetwood.	1714

Exeter.

Seth Ward	1662
Anthony Sparrow	1667
Thomas Lampleugh	1676
Jonathan Trelawney	1689
Offspring Blackhall	1707
Lancelot Blackburn	1716

Gloucester.

John Pritchet or Pritchard	1672
Robert Frampton	1681
Edward Fowler	1691
Richard Willis	1715

Hereford.

Herbert Croft	1662
Gilbert Ironside	1691
Humphrey Humphreys	1701
Philip Bisse	1713

Lichfield and Coventry.

Thomas Wood	1671
William Lloyd	1692
John Hough	1699
Edward Chandler	1714

Lincoln.

Benjamin Laney	1663
William Fuller	1667
Thomas Barlowe	1675
Thomas Tenison	1691
James Gardiner	1694
William Wake	1705
Edmund Gibson	1716

LLANDAFF.

Francis Davies	1667
William Lloyd	1675
William Beaw	1679
John Tyler	1707
John Hough	1690
William Talbot	1699
John Potter	1715

LONDON.

Humphry Henchman	1663
Henry Compton	1675
John Robinson	1713

NORWICH.

Anthony Sparrow	1676
William Lloyd	1685
John Moore	1691
Charles Trimnell	1708

OXFORD.

William Paul	1663
Walter Blandford	1665
Nathaniel Crew	1671
Henry Compton	1674
John Fell	1676
Samuel Parker	1686
Timothy Hall	1688
Edward Stillingfleet	1689
William Lloyd	1699
John Hough	1717

PETERBOROUGH.

Joseph Henshaw	1663
William Lloyd	1679
Thomas White	1685
Richard Cumberland	1691
White Kennet	1718

ROCHESTER.

John Dolben	1666
Francis Turner	1683
Thomas Sprat	1684
Francis Atterbury	1713

SALISBURY.

John Earle	1663
Alexander Hyde	1665
Seth Ward	1667
Gilbert Burnet	1689
William Talbot	1715

WINCHESTER.

Peter Mew	1684
Jonathan Trelawney	1707

WORCESTER.

John Earle	1662
Robert Skinner	1663
Walter Blandford	1671
James Fleetwood	1675
William Thomas	1683

YORK.

Richard Sterne	1664
John Dolben	1683
Thomas Lamplugh	1688
John Sharp	1691
William Dawes	1714

CARLISLE.

Edward Rainbow	1664
Thomas Smith	1684
William Nicholson	1702
Samuel Bradford	1718

CHESTER.

Henry Ferne	1662
George Hall	1662
John Wilkins	1668
John Pearson	1673
Thomas Cartwright	1686
Nicholas Stafford	1689
William Dawes	1708
Francis Gastrell	1714

DURHAM.

Nathaniel Crew	1674

SODOR AND MAN.

Isaac Barrow	1663
Henry Bridgeman	1671
John Lake	1682
Baptist Levinz	1684
[Vacant 5 years.]	
Thomas Wilson	1697

In demy 8vo, 21*s.*,

RELIGIOUS THOUGHT IN ENGLAND

FROM THE REFORMATION TO THE END OF LAST CENTURY.

A CONTRIBUTION TO THE HISTORY OF THEOLOGY.

By The REV. JOHN HUNT.

VOLUME I.

CONTENTS.

Chap. I.—Transubstantiation.—The difference between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, no narrow interval.—Reformation progressive.—Barnes—Frith.—Tyndale.—Doctrinal Documents.—Cranmer.—Ridley.—Latimer.—Hooper.—Bradford.—Philpot.—Hutchinson.

Chap. II.—The Church under Elizabeth.—The Consecrators of Archbishop Parker.—Elizabeth's first Bishops.—Jewel.—Becon.—Rise of the Puritans.—Grindal, Cartwright, and Whitgift.—Hooker and Travers.—Dr. John Bridges and Martin Marprelate.—Aylmer.—Bancroft.—Bilson.—Lord Bacon.

Chap. III.—Hampton Court Conference.—Field on the Church—Works of King James.—Overall's Convocation Book.—Bishop Andrewes.—Bilson and Broughton on the "Descent into Hell."—Archbishop Abbot.—The Sabbath Controversy.—Tithes.—The Five Points of Arminius.—Richard Montagu.—The Vicar of Grantham and his "altar."—Bishop Willams.—Archbishops Laud, Ussher.—Bishop Hall and the Smectymnians—Prynne on "Timothy and Titus."—John Milton.—Conference against Innovations at the Dean of Westminster's.

Chap. IV.—Westminster Assembly of Divines.—Twisse-Burges.—Cawdry.—Cheynell.—The Dissenting Brethren.—Thomas Goodwin on Independency.—The Savoy Declaration.—Rights of the Baptists—Controversy between Tombes and Marshall.—Family of Love.—Quakers.—Behmenists.—Rosicrucians.—Muggletonians.—Fifth Monarchy Men.—John Bidle.—Antinomian Controversy.—Peter Sterry.—John Owen.—John Goodwin.—Richard Baxter.

Chap. V.—The Restoration.—The King's Declaration.—The Savoy Conference.—Exceptions of the Ministers against the Prayer-Book.—The Bishop's Answer.—Baxter and Gunning.—Bishop Morton.—Bishop Cosin.—Bishop Walton.—Bishop Pearson.—Bishop Sanderson.—Dr. Hammond.—Herbert Thorndike.—Archbishop Bramhall.—Bishop Hopkins.—Jeremy Taylor.—John Gaule and Henry Jeanes.—Samuel Rutherford.—Liberty of Conscience.—Sir Thomas Browne.—Matthew Hale.

Chap. VI.—Rational Theologians.—John Hales.—Chillingworth.—Hobbes.—Replies to Hobbes.—Lord Clarendon.—Archbishop Tenison.—Archbishop Bramhall.—Samuel Clarke.—Bishop Parker.—The Cambridge Platonists.—Cudworth.—More.—John Smith.—Bishop Whichcot.—Bishop Cumberland.—Lord Herbert.—Replies to Lord Herbert.—Locke.—Halyburton.—Whitby.—Richard Baxter.

"Here we have clearness, vigour, and originality of style, and an abundance of new thought. . . . The views of a man who has not only studied his subject, but is a thorough master of it in every part. . . . He is a master in the art of analysing and condensing the thoughts and opinions of others; and in his biographical sketches of such men as Baxter, Milton, Cranmer, Hooker, George Fox, or Hammond, often manages to give us the pith of the question under discussion in a single page. We look on his present work as evincing talents of a high order; unflinching love of truth, great devoutness, and the boldest reliance on the power and value of reason being conspicuous throughout. The book will attract many thoughtful readers, and reward all who take the trouble to study it with the care which it deserves."—*Standard.*

"A more complete and faithful picture of English theology we do not know. The author's mode of treating his subject is very thorough, but at the same time he does what it is difficult enough to do in a book dealing with opinion, he escapes being dull, and has produced a volume which is sure to be extremely attractive to all interested in theological studies, and in watching the growth of freedom of thought."—*English Independent.*

"Mr. Hunt is a very able thinker and critic, commands a terse and very serviceable style for his matter and purpose, is a laborious and conscientious reader and historian, and has accordingly produced a book of great value. His former work is one of real merit, and his reputation will be enhanced by the present instalment of the important history which he has undertaken to write."—*London Quarterly Review.*

"Mr. Hunt has executed his task with much fairness and judgment, and has condensed the results of very extensive reading. The book treats of topics of the utmost importance, which are presented in an interesting manner, so that all persons, whatever may be the nature of their puruits, who are capable of reading a sensible book, will derive pleasure and instruction from the perusal of it. . . . We shall be glad to welcome the second volume on its appearance, and in the meantime have to thank Mr. Hunt for a very serviceable addition to a library."—*Christian Observer.*

"This work supplies a lack in our historico-theological literature. It not only traces the genesis and development of the successive schools which have ruled the realms of religious thought in England for the last three centuries, but it also contains a biographical sketch of the men, and an accurate analysis of the writings of the chief leaders of the schools. . . . We thank Mr. Hunt for a promising instalment of a work the conception of which was most happy; the execution of which bears all the marks of the learning, diligence, and impartiality of the accomplished author; and the contents of which ought to secure for it a place on the shelves of every well-selected library."—*Watchman.*

STRAHAN & CO., 56, LUDGATE HILL.

By the same Author.

Demy 8*vo*, 10*s*. 6*d*.

AN ESSAY ON PANTHEISM.

"The work of a man indefatigable in his pursuit of truth, not content with second-hand information where it was accessible to him at the fountain-head, making his task a labour of love, and proclaiming his results fearlessly. There is, we believe, no English treatise bringing together the same amount of information, given where it was possible in the words of his authorities and grouped with an instructive clearness."—*Contemporary Review.*

"The subject of this book is one which must always interest thinkers. . . . Mr. Hunt gives sufficient proof that he has read much on the subject, and spared no pains to apprehend its bearings. He has traversed a wide field, scattering his materials over it with a liberal hand. . . . We commend the volume to the favourable attention of the reader, as one deserving his perusal. The author is earnest and devout. He shows that he is an orthodox Churchman, as well as a man of reading and reflection. . . . He is no common-place writer; his book is well fitted to stimulate and enlighten the minds of those who are desirous to be introduced into the illustrious company of thinkers who have pondered over the profound problem of being."—*Athenæum.*

"For particular commendation we should select his account of the doctrine of Scotus Erigena, and especially his vindication, for it amounts to that, of Benedict Spinoza. Mr. Hunt's is a very good style, and well suited for setting before the reader intelligible summaries of philosophical systems which might be laboured into any degree of obscurity. It is concise without being peremptory. . . . He manifests no hostile spirit, and his object is evidently to conciliate. Christianity and Pantheism must be reconciled, otherwise it will be the worse for Christianity."—*Westminster Review.*

"The Curate of St. Ives has redeemed the credit of his order. The Church of Rome has awarded him its most distinguished honour of the Index, in company with Dr. Pusey, and the author of *Ecce Homo!* and we think he is fairly entitled to the distinction from the ability, the patience, and the honesty with which he has conducted the investigation that he felt called to enter upon. In the straightforward and attractive preface, he explains how he came to undertake the task of resolving the great religious question of the day, and how he gradually awoke to the magnitude of the work he had set himself. . . . Mr. Hunt is quite aware of the danger he incurs by his appeal to reason in these matters, but he is one of the few people who see that there is really no help for it, that a man must use his reason, if it is only for the purpose of making up his mind that he won't. In language that frequently rises into eloquence, he maintains the supremacy of the much-abused faculty, and he commends the outcome of his patient labour to the sympathies of those who feel the necessities of the age and appreciate the value of truthful inquiry."—*Spectator.*

"This learned and elaborate work will be hailed with thankfulness by such theological students as take an interest in tracing out, amongst all nations and in all ages, the struggles and developments of human thought in relation to the being and government of God. It will lead devout readers afresh to adore Him, *in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.*"—*Wesleyan Paper.*

"In passing round and over so wide a field, the author has brought out much that is both interesting and curious. Any reader who wishes to master the subject will find all the materials brought together to his hand within the single volume before us; and also reference to many original sources of information."—*Record.*

"It passes over a broad field, and occupies a space in English literature before vacant."—*Christian Examiner* (American).

STRAHAN & CO., 56, LUDGATE HILL.

WORKS

PUBLISHED BY

STRAHAN AND CO.,

56, LUDGATE HILL.

THE LIFE AND LETTERS OF HUGH MILLER. By PETER BAYNE, M.A. 2 vols. demy 8vo, 32*s*.

"Hugh Miller takes rank with the most notable men of this generation, and among the self-taught men of Scotland he holds the highest place after Burns. Mr. Bayne has written two volumes to tell the world what it lost in Hugh Miller, and he has done a difficult task well."—*Spectator*.

"Mr. Bayne's memoir deserves to take its place among the few specimens of standard biography."—*Nonconformist*.

REASONS FOR RETURNING TO THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. Crown 8vo, 5*s*.

"See that remarkable book, lately published, 'Reasons for Returning to the Church of England,' by a distinguished Roman Catholic."—*Dean Stanley* in the *Spectator*.

"The author, who gives us here his *Apologia*, is a thinker and writer of no common force and clearness, and his reasons are of more than usual interest."—*Guardian*.

MEMORIALS OF AGNES ELIZABETH JONES. By her SISTER. Third Edition. Crown 8vo, 6*s*.

"Her Christian love was wide and brave, and she laid down her life for her friends. Her example is a glorious one."—*Spectator*.

"It is really the duty of every one who can possibly do it to study the exceedingly beautiful character here presented to us. What she *did* was marvellous, but what she *was* is the deeper interest and the truer lesson of her life. Her work never mastered her, as important work is too apt to master even really earnest Christians; great as it was, she herself was greater, and able to hold it in its due place."—*Literary Churchman*.

KESHUB CHUNDER SEN'S ENGLISH VISIT. An Authorized Collection of his Principal Addresses delivered in this Country. Edited by S. D. COLLET. Crown 8vo, 9*s*.

UNIFORM WITH THE ABOVE,

LECTURES AND TRACTS. By KESHUB CHUNDER SEN. Edited by S. D. Collet. Crown 8vo, 5*s*.

CONTENTS:—*First Series.*—Jesus Christ: Europe and Asia.—Great Men.—Regenerating Faith.—The Future Church. *Second Series.*—The Religious Importance of Mental Philosophy, I. and II.—Religious and Social Reformation.—Prayer: True Faith.—A Voice from the Himalayas.—The Theist's Prayer-Book.

"To Miss Collet, for her indefatigable labours in making the Brahmo Somaj properly known in England, both India and England have much reason to be grateful."—*Spectator*.

MEMORIALS OF CHARLES PARRY, Commander, Royal Navy. By his Brother, the Right Rev. EDWARD PARRY, D.D., Bishop Suffragan of Dover. Small 8vo, 5*s*.

"The Memorials of Charles Parry by his brother, the Suffragan Bishop of Dover, is a book to stand by the side of the life of Hedley Vicars. Captain Parry did in the navy much what Captain Vicars did in the army. He set a steady, quiet example of pious life, and lost no opportunity of doing good to others. The biography is written in a simple and pleasing style."—*Guardian*.

EPISODES IN AN OBSCURE LIFE: A Curate's Experiences in the Tower Hamlets. Popular Edition. Crown 8vo.

"We could not easily exhaust all the thoughts suggested by this interesting and valuable book."—*Spectator*.

"These 'Episodes' unite the accuracy of the photograph with the strength and colour of a painting. The author is anonymous, but whoever he is, his name is genius."—*Illustrated Times*.

"This is one of the few books that leave the critic no alternative but simply to heap together words of eulogy. Its least and lowest merit is its literary workmanship, and yet we scarcely know where we could look for more vivid pictures of accurate observation, of chaste simplicity, and unpretentious power. The large-hearted geniality, manly piety, and unwearied benevolence of the anonymous writer inform his eye and guide his hand, throwing gleams of radiance, aspects of humour, and visions of hope over the sad conditions of squalid misery which he describes without a particle of Dickens's falsetto. . . . If our recommendation could avail, it should carry this book into every rich man's house and every comfortable home in the land."—*British Quarterly Review*.

THE MIRACLES OF OUR LORD. By GEORGE MACDONALD. Crown 8vo, 5*s*.

"It is not only exhilarating to come in contact with such fresh views of Scripture as we here receive from Mr. MacDonald, it is blissful. . . . The method of his appeal is that of the poet, wrapt in the absorbing sweetness of spiritual contemplation; and in these days of overstrained intellectual activity, when at the same time an imperative need is felt for human and intimate readings of Scripture mysteries, his manner of teaching is most effective."—*Nonconformist*.

"Everywhere marked by touches of true genius, by deep and acute reflection, by sober judgment, and by a solemn and tender piety as valuable as it is rare."—*Standard*.